

878

1500

F5-5

1960

no. 1

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

, full Committee hearing,

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE

ON

FISH AND GAME ,

*

CALIFORNIA
STATE LIBRARY
MAY 8 1962
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Room 4202,
State Capitol,
Sacramento

January 18-19, 1960

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
SERVICE

DO NOT REMOVE FROM ROOM

PAULINE L. DAVIS, CHAIRMAN

*

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE

ON

FISH AND GAME

Full Committee Hearing

Sacramento

January 18-19, 1960

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pauline L. Davis, Chairman
Vincent Thomas, Vice Chairman
Don A. Allen, Sr.
Jack A. Beaver
Montivel A. Burke
Bert DeLotto
Paul J. Lunardi
Eugene G. Nisbet
Alan G. Pattee
John C. Williamson

OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT

Senator Alan A. Erhart

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Helen R. Trainor,
Committee Secretary
Kent DeChambeau,
Legislative Counsel
William F. Scheuermann, Jr.
Committee Consultant

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
<u>WITNESSES:</u>	
J. Doyle Gray	7
Walter T. Shannon	66
Ray E. Welsh	87
Edward F. Bruce	95
N. B. Keller	101
Blanche Kral	111
Reg Richardson	129
Ardis M. Walker	135
George D. Difani	149
Joe Borden	162
Noon Recess	66
Afternoon Recess	123

---o0o---

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1960, 10:00 O'CLOCK, A.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: The Committee will convene now to discuss the subject matters that are before us both for today and tomorrow. For the information of the audience, and evidently there is a great deal of interest in the subject of fish and game of which I am sure we are all aware, this particular committee is an interim committee functioning under House Resolution 326.

I would like to introduce the members that are present at this time, although there are three that are going to be just slightly late today whom we will introduce at a later time. To my far right is Assemblyman Don Allen from Los Angeles. Next to him is Alan Pattee, and next to him is Vince Thomas, Vice Chairman of the Committee on Fish and Game from San Pedro, and Jack Beaver, Assemblyman from Redlands. Next is Montivel Burke from Los Angeles. Then to my far left we have the Senator of the Standing Committee of Fish and Game, Senator Erhart, sitting with us today from San Luis Obispo County. We welcome you, Senator, and we hope you can be of some assistance to us, and you certainly have the privilege of asking any questions or making any comments that you wish to make.

We also, for the purpose of acquainting the audience with our staff, we have to my right Mr. Kent De Chambeau, who is a representative for the Legislature on fish and game matters from the Legislative Counsel and the consultant for this committee on fish and game, Mr. Bill Scheuermann, and to my left the one that

really does the majority of the work, my secretary, Mrs. Helen Trainor. We also have with us Miss Alice Book, who is the court reporter today, and our sergeant at arms, Paul Sampson.

Now, this hearing has been called to give the sportsmen of the State an opportunity to express their opinions on the costs of various services and programs of the Department of Fish and Game.

It is our hope here that the license buying public will tell this committee and their Department of Fish and Game if they are satisfied with the current and proposed level of programming and the returns they receive, what areas might be expanded, and what areas might require cutbacks. It is vital that the sportsmen make this decision. It is also my opinion that this committee offer itself as a sounding board for these opinions and decisions. As we all know, fish and game is a highly controversial field. We cannot realistically hope to settle all the differences of opinion in the field in so short a period of time. But at least we should be able to determine at this hearing where some of the differences lie and proceed to some possible avenue of solution.

We are approaching the subject matter of this hearing today in as impartial a manner as possible. In this regard, we have requested the presence and testimony of as many sportsmen's groups and individuals as possible, comprised on a statewide representation. The response to our invitations has been most gratifying, as you are able to see by our agenda. We will place every witness here today and tomorrow under oath, prior to his testimony,

to dispel any impression that anyone is being discriminated against.

Regarding the mechanics of this hearing, it is our intention to have the various department personnel and legislative staff agency representatives available at the witness tables at all times in order that there may be an opportunity for each witness, in his turn, to ask any questions of these people, and in order that department personnel and the others will be able to ask questions of the witnesses as they appear at the front table.

It is our desire that any questions between the groups be asked through the Chair for proper identification to the court reporter.

It should be emphasized at the outset that we are most desirous that the atmosphere at this hearing be as friendly and constructive as possible.

It would seem appropriate at this time to echo the words of Governor Edmund G. Brown at the Associated Sportsmen's convention, September 19, 1959, at Santa Cruz, when he stated to the sportsmen of this State that "the fish and game program of our State is really your program. It is based on proposals you submit and upon advice solicited from you. You owe it to yourselves, and to your fellow Californians, to give your full and energetic support to it."

With this at this time I would like to ask the following people to come up to the table, make themselves comfortable, and

that is Mr. Shannon, the new Director of the Department of Fish and Game; Mr. Harry Anderson, who is now the Deputy Director of the Department of Fish and Game; Robert Calkins, Director of Conservation Education; Alex Calhoun, Chief of Inland Fisheries Branch. And I would appreciate it if you gentlemen would be seated to the left and leave that one particular chair for the witness that comes up. Also Ben Glading, Chief of the Game Management Branch.

MR. SHANNON: May I say, Mrs. Chairman, Dick Croker, Chief of the Marine Fisheries Branch, is down with Charley Johnson and as soon as he returns he will come up.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And also John Alden, who is your Fiscal Officer, is he here today?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And Jack Fraser, who is the Water Projects Coordinator.

MR. SHANNON: Madame Chairman, there is one branch chief we don't have up here, Mr. LaMar, if you care to have him.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Not at this time - I don't think it is necessary at this time.

Before we continue with the first witness today I might take a few minutes to introduce Assemblyman John Williamson to my left from Bakersfield, and I welcome you, John.

Now, first of all, the first witness will be Mr. Gray, representing the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report. Will you come forward and you can take the oath with these gentlemen. I will

state your names again and after that you will all take the oath together: Mr. J. Doyle Gray, Mr. Walter Shannon, Mr. Harry Anderson, Mr. Robert Calkins, Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Ben Glading, Mr. John Alden, and Jack Fraser.

(Thereupon the above-named gentlemen were duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, Mr. Gray, will you proceed with the points that you are to discuss relative to the report that was submitted to the two Houses of the Legislature and the specific points, as I recall, that you were going to cover are contained on pages 162 and 163 of the report, so if the members of the committee wish to turn to pages 162 and 163 of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report that is before you, we will proceed. Will you proceed, Mr. Gray?

MR. GRAY: Madame Chairman, and members of the committee and ladies and gentlemen, before I give my testimony I would like to address one question to the chairman. How much time would you like me to devote to this subject?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: As much time as it will take, Mr. Gray, to cover it adequately. You may use your discretion.

MR. GRAY: Thank you. I don't have a formal statement to present to you, but I would like to refer to some of the paragraphs in the chapter of our report that contains the exhibits which you have directed our attention to.

On page 158 I would like to read from this page and some of the subsequent pages for a few minutes.*

"Early in the survey it was recognized that a well rounded system of management controls did not exist. Although the Department had made an analysis of the 1954-55 expenditures in an attempt to report the amount of effort going into the various wildlife programs, such information was incomplete and also dated."

Our thought in this particular area was to present a businessman's approach to add a new dimension to the problem of controversy in the Department and in the public which concerned the cost of the various artificial and wild fish and game programs. Our thought was to bring in a close correlation of revenue and costs.

"Consequently it was determined to be essential to make an analysis of the Department's 1957-58 revenues and expenditures, both to provide a basis for evaluation of Department programs and to test the feasibility of developing a system of management controls."

Exhibits 33, 34 and 35 shown on pages 162 and 163 develop our theory.

"Because of the need to examine expenditures of time and money relating to the fiscal year 1957-58, it was necessary to obtain data on an estimated, rather than on an actual basis. The fiscal year was largely past, and actual records were not available. However, a trial run was made on obtaining the desired information on an estimated basis. This pilot run proved to be a useful and feasible plan which was applied to all expenditures

and revenues.

"In this connection, it is important to recognize that because the basic data are based on a system of estimated allocations, it is not possible to assign an unwarranted exactness to the results which were obtained. Nevertheless, the general conclusions which were drawn are valid and useful to a very considerable degree."

". . . .It is helpful to recognize the several benefits which are possible:

"1. It would provide the basis for a clearer understanding in the minds of the Legislature, the wildlife sportsmen, the commercial fishing interests and the general public of the programs and activities of the Department.

"2. It would provide quantitative measurement of the various fish and game programs and activities to the end that those responsible for formulating and administering the Department's ~~programs~~ would be better able to evaluate results in comparison to expenditures, and so to evaluate the proper emphasis to be given to the various wildlife programs and activities," to the end that those responsible for formulating and administering the Department's programs would be better able to evaluate results in comparison to expenditures.

"3. It would provide a basis for comparing major program costs with corresponding revenues, and thereby increase the factual knowledge upon which to decide the proper levels of license fees and expenditures with respect to major programs.

"This survey carefully reviewed and appraised these benefits in detail. Early in the conduct of the work it was determined that a broad analysis of the Department's 1957-58 expenditures and revenues would be highly desirable both from the viewpoint of testing the feasibility of improving management controls, and from the viewpoint of gaining an overall knowledge of the relative degrees of emphasis being currently given to major wildlife programs."

Our analysis proceeded therefore to identify the total Department costs in terms of the following programs in game management. We looked at big game, water fowl, wild pheasant, raised pheasant and other upland game. In the inland fish programs we looked at wild trout including fingerling plants, raised trout, warm water fish, steelhead, salmon in inland waters, and striped bass.

In the marine fish programs we looked at salmon, in ocean waters, tuna, bottom fish, shell fish, pelagic fish, and other sports fish.

The selection of these wildlife programs was made so as to result in programs easily identified in the minds of the sporting public, as well as being meaningful ones in terms of the Department's activities. It was also determined that some insight into the functional composition of the Department's 1957-58 expenditures would be informative. Although a more detailed analysis would have been desirable, it was felt that practical considerations should limit this portion of the

analysis to the following broad categories:

"1. Management and operations -- All activities not specifically included in the other categories.

"2. Research -- Both Department and Federal aid projects, at 100% of costs, which are research in nature.

"3. Law enforcement -- Direct law enforcement activities only.

"4. Conservation education -- All general public information activities, including attendance at sportsmen's meetings and time devoted to hunter safety program.

"5. Administration -- Headquarters and regional administration.

"6. Miscellaneous -- Principally capital outlay expenditures, as well as nonrecurring special items.

"These facts concerning the nature and relationships of expenditures provided the following bases for making the analysis the Department's 1957-58 expenditures:

"1. Salaries and wages of the game management, inland fisheries, and wildlife protection personnel were distributed to the various wildlife programs on the basis of estimated time allocations obtained from the various functional supervisors throughout the departmental headquarters and the regions."

And this was on the basis of arrangements that we made with each one of the regions to report the time allocations of their personnel, each and every person in each region.

"2. General and administrative salaries of departmental

headquarters and regional headquarters personnel were allocated to the various wildlife programs on the basis of wage and salary allocations resulting from step one above, which were appropriate to the area of activity involved.

"3. Specific operating expenses and other expenditures and reimbursements were identified to particular wildlife programs to the extent possible, on the basis of analysis.

"4. General operating expenses not identifiable to specific wildlife programs were allocated to programs on the basis of the relative distribution of salaries and wages of the particular organizational unit involved determined by steps one and two.

"5. Allocations of regional expenditures by primary functions were made on the basis of estimates provided by the functional supervisors in each of the regions.

"6. All departmental headquarters expenditures were distributed to primary functions on the basis of the nature of such expenditures.

"The accuracy of the resulting analysis is not absolute. However, the results are generally reliable and provide a considerable insight into the overall direction of the Department's operations. The experience and knowledge gained from this analysis also permit certain specific conclusions and recommendations concerning the feasibility and implementation of a continuing cost accounting program for the Department."

Exhibit 33 following page 162 presents the results of the

analysis of the 1957-58 expenditures. As is indicated this exhibit reflects the 1957-58 expenditures by wildlife program, primary function, and organizational unit.

I refer you at this time to that exhibit which you can pull out of the report and lay it out from the report and watch as I draw some of the significant conclusions made after our analysis of this particular exhibit.

You will note from the standpoint of wildlife programs that game and inland fish programs each account for approximately 40% of the total expenditures of the Department. Marine fish programs approximate 20% of the total expenditures.

From the viewpoint of types of Department functions, management and operations consume approximately 43% of the total budget. Law enforcement consumes approximately 19% and administration and research each utilize approximately 14% of the budget.

Conservation education utilizes approximately 5% of all expenditures, and miscellaneous expenditures largely major capital outlays also utilize approximately 5% of the total expenditures.

Now, next we had an analysis of the revenues for 1957-58.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Allen.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: May we have Mr. Gray repeat the percentages?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you repeat the percentages you gave him?

MR. GRAY: You will find those percentages on page 160,

the second column.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Fine. I am sorry to interrupt you.

MR. GRAY: A word of explanation as to how we arrived at those figures. We simply took the total at the bottom, the grand total at the bottom, which was \$10,632,893.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is the last figure on page 162.

MR. GRAY: And then took our various programs - as you can see across the top, we have game programs, inland fish programs and marine fish programs. We took those totals at the bottom of the page and divided them into our grand total to get the relationship of game and inland fish programs, each accounting for approximately 40% of the total expenditures of the Department, and we found that marine fish programs approximate 20% of the total expenditures of the Department.

Then, as you can see, also we have gathered our figures by management and operations, law enforcement, conservation education, administration, research, and miscellaneous. Again we took those total figures at the far left, far right, I am sorry, of the page and divided those into our grand total and arrived at our conclusions that management and operations consume approximately 43% of the total budget, law enforcement consumes approximately 19%, and administration and research each utilize approximately 14% of the budget.

Conservation education utilizes approximately 5% of all expenditures, and miscellaneous expenditures, largely major capital outlays, also utilize approximately 5% of the total

expenditures.

Our next step was to analyze the revenues for 1957-58 and this provides another source of significant management control information.

Accordingly, 1957-58 revenues were distributed to the same major wildlife programs as were used in the analysis of the expenditures.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Just a moment, so that everyone is following us, that is the next chart as you turn the page, I guess it will be.

MR. GRAY: This chart that I am going to be referring to in a moment is 34, and it is the one with the body of notes spread across the bottom of the page.

"Because basic fishing and hunting licenses are required for pursuit of all respective fish and game, it was necessary to develop reasonable and practical methods to allocate such basic revenues to specific fish and game programs.

"The following constitute the general basis upon which the allocations were made:

"1. Those license revenues and taxes which are identifiable to specific wildlife programs were so allocated. Examples of this category of revenues are deer and bear tag revenues, pheasant tags, salmon tax and privilege taxes on pelagic fish.

"2. License revenues relating to broad classes of programs were allocated on the most accurate basis available. The bulk of the license revenues fall into general categories such

as angling and hunting licenses fees. The most logical basis for allocating such revenues was determined to be on the basis of sportsmen effort devoted to the various species. The only available measurement of relative sportsmen effort was time data obtained from the Department's questionnaire surveys of hunters and anglers. On this basis, allocations were made to the various major wildlife programs."

I would like to re-emphasize this point. The only basis by which we could allocate the revenues for the major figures constituting license fees for hunting and fishing was to use the Department's questionnaires gathered from representative samples of sportsmen as to the time that they used, the amount of time that they used to hunt and fish the various species.

"3. The divisions between revenue attributable to 'put-and-take' and natural harvesting of trout and pheasant were made on the relative quantities of the catch or bag.

"4. Certain other revenues related to a large number of programs and were allocated on a basis proportionate to the revenues allocated to the various programs. Such revenues included confiscated fish and property, court fines and interest on investments."

The notes accompanying exhibit 34 itemize in detail the specific basis of allocation of each item of the 1957-58 revenues and with your permission I should like to now turn to exhibit 34 and discuss the notes which are on the bottom of that particular chart.

As you can see this particular exhibit is arranged somewhat similar to that of exhibit 33. We have game management programs, a group across the top, inland fish programs, another group across the top, and marine fish programs, another group across the top. Then, down the left hand side of this chart we have the various sources of revenue, the general category of licenses, permits and tags, less commissions, general taxes such as fish tax, salmon tax, kelp harvester and shellfish; privilege taxes; miscellaneous, such as leases of kelp and oyster beds, inspection fees, confiscated fish and property, and miscellaneous; court fines; interest on investments; and federal funds.

Now, angling licenses are one of the principal revenue incomes for the Department and as you can see totaled \$4,092,110.

Now, if you will look at note A at the bottom of the page I would like to discuss how we allocated this four million dollar income on angling to the various fish programs.

"1. The revenue from sale of angling licenses was distributed to the various fish programs on the basis of sports fishing effort as revealed by the most current data available.

"2. The total angling license revenue was split 28% to marine fishing and 72% to inland fishing on the basis of man days spent by angling license buyers on each of these categories in 1956, as revealed by the Department's questionnaire to a representative group of such anglers.

"3. Within these two major groupings the revenue was allocated to wildlife programs as follows:

"Inland fish programs -- On the basis of the Department's 1955 questionnaire, it was determined that man days were spent by fresh water anglers in the following ratio:

"Trout, 49.9%; steelhead, 3.9%; salmon, 4.5%; striped bass, 14.7%; warm water fish, 27%." This adds up to 100%.

"The amount of trout fishing revenue was further split between the catchable trout program and the wild trout program on the ratio of estimated catch in 1955:

"(1) Total 1955 trout catch, as computed from 1955 questionnaire - 33,700,000.

"(2) On the basis of departmental opinion that the anglers' catch estimates were approximately 100% overstated, the adjusted total catch was estimated to be 16,850,000."

You have sworn me, Mrs. Davis. This estimate that we have here is the best that we can get. This is not Booz, Allen and Hamilton's estimate as to whether or not the fishermen overstated their catch.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We understand that this information as you have stated has been obtained by you from the Department relative to the questionnaire that they sent out in the year 1955, right?

MR. GRAY: Fine.

"(3) Of the total catch, it was estimated that two-thirds of the 7,700,000 catchables planted were harvested, or 5,150,000. This constituted 30.6% of the total adjusted catch, which was rounded off to 30% for the purposes of this analysis."

This made it easy to handle the figure. Now, these two points then show how we worked with the inland fish programs in this allocation.

Now, the marine fish programs were a slightly different situation.

"On the basis of the Department's 1956 statistics on numbers of fish caught by anglers fishing from licensed party boats, the following distribution by major programs was calculated:

"Salmon, 3.5%; tuna, 2.0%; bottom fish, 62.5%; shellfish, 1.5%; other sports fish, 30.5%." This totals 100%.

"These statistics do not reflect surf angling effort. However, no such data were available and consequently the above-described basis was used as the best available."

The next category under angling--

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Gray, if you will pardon me, so I am clear on one particular statement that you made, as far as the difference between the percentage of the artificially raised trout program under your figures and the natural trout, is the estimate of 30.6 the catchable artificial program?

MR. GRAY: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Of the total 49.9?

MR. GRAY: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I just wanted to make sure of that.

MR. GRAY: Yes, ma'am. The figures involved there were the 16,850,000 trout which is the Department's estimates of total

trout catch and then of the total catch we figured, again this was using Department figures, two-thirds of the 7,700,000 catchables planted were harvested. This was 5,150,000 trout catchables which were caught and this 5,150,000 is 30.6% of 16,850,000. We rounded that off to a 30% figure and that was applied to the 49.9% of the trout time shown in the little chart previous to that.

With regard to angling stamps, I would like to refer you now to Note B at the bottom of the chart.

"1. It was estimated that 574,000 of the one dollar angling stamps would be purchased by anglers for the purpose of trout fishing. The remaining licenses were distributed to the various fresh water fish programs on the ratio of man days spent on the various inland fish programs in 1956, as indicated in paragraph 3 of Note A.

"2. The split between catchable trout and wild trout was made on the same basis as indicated in paragraph 3 of Note A."

The same 30%, in other words, was applied to the angling stamps and the figure of 49.9% was applied to this total of \$1,081,668.00, which constituted the total income from angling stamps that went to the inland fish program.

Fish tags and permits, which constituted principally trout for restaurants was allocated to the wild trout program.

Colorado River permits which was principally warm water fish went to that category.

Fish breeder and importer licenses and permits went to the wild trout program.

Then the category of commercial fishermen, fish dealers and processors, boat registrations and permits total \$173,707. which is primarily a marine fish program, and may I refer you to note C at this stage?

"1. These three categories of revenue were allocated to the various major programs on the ratio of the value of commercial fish landings in California for 1956:

"Salmon, 5.9%; tuna, 81.4%; bottom fish, 1.5%; shellfish, 3.9%; pelagic fish, 7.3%." This makes a total of 100%.

"2. This basis of allocation is not completely accurate on two counts. First, boat registration permits are required for party boat operators as well as commercial fishing boats."

Maybe I had better elucidate just a little more on that first comment. This assumed that there was no difference between these two categories, boat registration for party boat operators and commercial fishing boats when in reality there is some difference. However, we could not delineate or define any further than we did on that particular one. Consequently, we simply regarded it as a lump sum to be distributed in our overall ratio rather than between commercial and party boat fishing.

"Second, the relative values of commercial fish landings can vary considerably from year to year, depending upon the abundance of various species. Nevertheless, the basis of allocation adopted was the most reasonable one available."

The next category in our exhibit 33 was hunting. The income totaled \$1,858,005. which was allocated to the various game management programs according to Note D.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Gray, I think perhaps with the permission of the committee, before we go into the game programs, that it might be well to clarify any questions that might be desirous of being answered on the fish, such as trout and other fisheries that you have mentioned here. Are there any questions by members of the committee on any of the statements?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask the Chairman a question? All this information that is being given, what is the purpose, to show where the money is coming from and where it is going?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is right. The revenue, how it is expended, Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: And Mr. Gray got this information from the Department?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: This is what he has stated time and time again.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: You got the information from the Fish and Game Department?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. SHANNON: May I say something, Mrs. Davis?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes.

MR. SHANNON: We furnished much of the data available here and that does not necessarily mean we concur with the conclusions that have been reached or the interpretation of such data.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, well, we understand that and you will have your opportunity to ask Mr. Gray any questions as to how he arrived at these conclusions. Mr. Thomas, do you wish to proceed

with any of your questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: No, I was just trying to find out where we are going, I mean what is the ultimate.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: As you recall, the sportsmen paid for a report and this is it, Mr. Thomas, and these are the ones who made the report to us and we are going over their percentages, and how they arrived at them for our information, although we may disagree with them and so may the Department and so may the sportsmen, but in view of the fact the Booz, Allen and Hamilton people have never appeared before our committee before particularly explaining the expenses of these programs, I felt it necessary they be here to explain them to us.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I was just wondering how did you arrive at the figures here on estimating where the money was spent? This is all your opinion as to where it was spent. Where did you gather the information other than what the Department gave you?

MR. GRAY: You are referring to exhibit 33, is that right, sir?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Yes.

MR. GRAY: The figures that we have here are the result of our analysis of the budget for one thing, plus a one-month sample which we took during the latter part of fiscal 1957-58 by arranging with the department to have all of their people, and this was all of the field people, tell us how they used their time during that month. We asked them to submit time reports.

We analyzed those time reports, and on the basis of that analysis we prepared this distribution. Now, I mentioned to you in the case of certain of the expenditures for supplies, materials and other things, that we had to allocate those on the basis of what we found the people in the Department or in a particular organizational unit within the Department, how they used their time. We allocated overhead, in other words, on the basis of how we found the direct labor being applied to the various functions and to the various wild life programs.

I should add to this, Mr. Thomas, that the Department had made an effort to get at something similar to this a year or so previous. However, our analysis went considerably further than any that the Department had made previous to this particular survey of ours, and we asked them to supply us with data which we used, but which they were not prepared to furnish without our guidance as to how to go about it. They were doing things, that is perfectly true, but this was submitted at our specific request according to our specifications.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions? Mr. Burke.

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: I was wondering if this isn't a kind of wheel within a wheel. Weren't we supposed to have a report separate from that of the Fish and Game? It seems now this is a rehash of the Fish and Game and not an unbiased report.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, Mr. Burke, are you directing that question to me?

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: Well, anyone who can answer it.

MR. SHANNON: I am not quite sure I understand his question.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Burke, would you restate your question?

MR. BURKE: Yes, I was wondering if this report was really a confirmation of the Fish and Game report or if it was to be a separate one from the report, I mean, to see how the two would match up? It now seems that this is simply a report furnished by the Fish and Game, and I thought we were to have a separate report.

MR. GRAY: Are you talking about my presentation to you, sir?

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: That is right.

MR. GRAY: Well, our work for the Legislature has been to prepare this report.

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: That is right.

MR. GRAY: Now, are you suggesting that my appearance today was to bring a new report to you?

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: Well, that is what I am trying to find out, whether this was to be a new report separate from that of the Fish and Game finding it to be wrong, or whether it was to be a rehash of the Fish and Game report.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Perhaps I can clarify this a little bit, Mr. Gray. I think what Mr. Burke is saying is an opinion that perhaps ~~perhaps more than one~~ individual has had all along and that was that in the appropriation of this one hundred thousand some-odd dollars

that the Legislature made for an independent, and I want to stress that "independent" report of the activity and its justification of different programs of the Department of Fish and Game, that they felt, I believe, what Mr. Burke is also interested in, that it not be in any way connected with the information that you might gain from the State Department of Fish and Game, that it was supposedly to be your own evaluation by itself, but I doubt, in answer to you, Mr. Burke, in relationship to the trout program and trying to determine from the overall revenues, angling revenues, as to what portion of that program is artificially raised - that is something where they would almost have to obtain some of the figures from the Department in order to make this determination, isn't that correct?

MR. GRAY: Well, see if I can answer Mr. Burke's question here. You can't separate the Department of Fish and Game from a survey of the Department of Fish and Game. They are one and the same thing. The Department is being surveyed. It is being reported upon. Consequently, we had to use a lot of the data that was available within the Department in our analysis.

However, as to whether we were an independent group making an independent survey, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that is closely associated with this but what it is independent because we had to refrain under the specifications of our contract from discussing our results, our conclusions, our findings, our recommendations with the Department.

Consequently, there was no opportunity for us to discuss

either informally or formally our final recommendations with the Department and we would have liked to do it. We normally in our relationships with client organizations - this was a slightly different situation - we like to discuss our findings with the people concerned to make sure that they understand our conclusions and recommendations and as much as possible to get many of our recommendations into effect before we submit our final report.

Now, that was not the case here. We did not work with the Department of Fish and Game on a cooperative development of any of our conclusions, cooperative development of any of our recommendations. It was specifically stated that we should not do this, that this was to be a completely independent report and that is what it is. That is why you find Mr. Shannon making the statement here that while the Department submitted some of these figures, they don't entirely agree with the analysis, the conclusions, or the recommendations that arise out of these figures, and they probably don't because they have never had the opportunity to discuss them with us and to be convinced of the authority of our presentation.

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: That clarifies in my mind the statement that Mr. Shannon made. I wondered what the conclusion was eventually going to be, whether this is as I said an impartial survey.

MR. GRAY: It is impartial, sir.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Before we continue, may I briefly interrupt to introduce two other members

of the Fish and Game Committee, Mr. Lunardi on my far left from Roseville, and also Mr. Bert De Lotto from Fresno. Are there any other questions by the members? Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Mr. Gray, I just want to clear up one point. You stated that the Department authorized you to make contact with each of their employees to determine how they spent their time?

MR. GRAY: We did not make contact directly with each employee. We made it through their supervision.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Are we to infer you had from every employee of the Department of Fish and Game a breakdown as to how their time is spent?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: From each and everyone?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Thank you. That is what I wanted to clear up.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Allen.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Mr. Gray, in order to clarify this a little better, the joint budget committee of the Senate and Assembly were your clients?

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: And you went into this on the basis that it was to be a fact-finding study?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Now, as any C.P.A. or any other group

of persons, they went in there and you took such data as were available, isn't that right?

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: And you had to get the information where you could get it and in the manner in which it was given to you?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Now then, what you have done, you have come out with, being under a restriction by your clients, the ones that hired you to make this survey, you have had to make your interpolations without any discussion with the Department of Fish and Game about various historic relationships or why this method was adopted or the usual thing that you would find in going into an industrial plant, is that what you are trying to say?

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir, that is a very excellent statement of the situation.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: So, therefore there would be a margin of question on both sides, on your side, and a question on the part of Fish and Game because they probably feel that they didn't have an opportunity to tell their side or the reasons for certain things?

MR. GRAY: That is quite right, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: That is where we find ourselves this morning?

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: But to all intents and purposes you served your client on the basis of their specifications and obtained such data as was humanly possible or intelligently possible to find?

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir, and we should state here that being experienced in doing this kind of work, the advantage was certainly on our side to ask the kind of questions that produced the kind of facts and data that we needed. We were able to penetrate very deep in certain areas, getting supplies of data and statements that were necessary from the Department without their comprehending our purpose.

Consequently, we feel that we have made a very penetrating analysis here, although it certainly is true that the Department is in no position to understand our conclusions completely.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: That produces a certain climate of suspect area from time to time without being able to discuss these problems with the various management?

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Gray, I see according to your report you have made some definite recommendations on a possible change in the approach of the trout program in order to decrease the cost of the artificially raised trout. Would you go into that phase of it now, please? I think that is on page 77 of your report where you actually made some recommendations relative to

some possible changes that should take place in the artificial program of this entire situation.

MR. GRAY: This in on page 77, you say?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In your recommendations on the bottom of the page. I would like you to go into that phase of it. It carries over onto page 78.

MR. GRAY: This set of recommendations that you are referring to here have to do with reducing the clerical workload.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, the cost of the program, whatever the things are that are involved in artificially raised programs.

MR. GRAY: I don't think that is on page 77.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, what page is it on then? It starts on page 77.

MR. GRAY: Oh, page 77. I am sorry.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: On the chemical treatment of water - that is the title of it.

MR. GRAY: I am sorry, I thought you said 177.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I am asking this in view of the fact that percentage-wise the cost of the artificially raised trout is very high so I want to know what you recommend as to its possible alternative.

MR. GRAY: Yes, ~~in a way~~. Well, I would have to qualify what I can say here. This Chapter 5, which starts on page 66, on Inland Fisheries Management was prepared by Mr. C. J. Campbell, who was one of the experts that we employed to work with us on this survey and the recommendations that you are referring to on the bottom

of page 77 are recommendations that he prepared. These are his recommendations. We took them on the basis that he was an expert in inland fisheries management and consequently I don't want to give you the impression that I am an expert on inland fisheries management, but I will be happy to read the recommendations that we made in this chapter which we as Booz, Allen and Hamilton, support wholeheartedly.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, then will you proceed? Evidently you support them or otherwise you wouldn't have permitted him to include them in your report.

MR. GRAY: We support them, but I cannot answer detailed questions concerning these points.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right.

MR. GRAY: Recommendation one. "Find means of financing chemical treatment of some of the larger trash fish infested lakes and reservoirs that should be providing more fishing."

There is a considerable discussion of these particular areas. The upshot of this particular recommendation, however, is to take a number of the waters within the state and make them habitable for natural fish which can be propagated on their own rather than artificially in the hatcheries.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Probably I can help you - on the top of page 78 there is a continuing--

MR. GRAY: Let me read this particular paragraph. Would that be all right?

"Habitat and downstream improvement is an important phase

of any fish management program, and all facets from flow maintenance dams to aquatic weed control have a place. However, it is not a complete cure for all ills and cannot replace all other activities. Control of fish populations through chemical means and barrier removal and laddering are the most productive forms in terms of fish produced for the creel. The story on stream improvement work in western waters and its limitations should be disseminated more widely. Opportunity for this type of work is rapidly decreasing while opportunities for chemical control of population are increasing. When large populations of undesirable fish are removed and the productive potential they have been using is turned to raising game fish, the angler profits. The chemical control program can stand considerable emphasis."

Now, in addition to this particular chapter on inland fisheries management, we looked at this whole subject of improving the natural habitat for fish in this state and you will find in the chapter which follows the chapter we have just been discussing and this particular chapter starts on page 170 and it is entitled, "Cost reduction opportunities", and on page 174 under the heading of "Increasing natural production of fish in California reservoirs and lakes", we took the recommendations advanced in Chapter 5 which advocated that the Department concentrate on increasing the annual yield of game fish in California's reservoirs and lakes.

We used some analyses that the Department had developed on the problem of improving natural habitat. As a matter of fact, I believe it was Mr. Calhoun who had prepared a paper on this subject.

We took some of the facts that he had developed. We analyzed these and developed further a program which we set forth as a recommended program in our report here on pages 174 and 175 which covered a number of the problems set forth first by saying that we realized that doing this job of improving the natural habitat for producing fish is going to take time and money. We then found that the potential was considerable. As a matter of fact we figured on this chart here, let's see, it is Exhibit 44, that 2,785,880 pounds of additional fish could be produced each year by improving the natural habitat in the various lakes and reservoirs, and that this would be more than adequate to provide for the fishing pressures that would be forthcoming in the next few years which would avoid the necessity of increasing the amount of artificially propagated trout in the hatcheries.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Gray, so that I am correct in my assumption, what you are saying is that the Department should concentrate more heavily on stream improvement and lake improvement with adequate food for the fish to propagate, the wild trout, rather than to go into an expanded program perhaps or even the continued program as far as the artificially raised trout, which is the catchable trout, is concerned?

MR. GRAY: Madame Chairman, we recommended that the natural habitat for both trout and warm water fish be improved in this State. We did not recommend that the catchable trout program be expunged.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I know that, but I am saying--

MR. GRAY: We did recommend some rearrangements subject to some problems of maintaining brood stock and proper hatchery conditions in the existing larger hatcheries. We recommended that some of the smaller ones which were inefficient and ineffective be closed, but we did not recommend that the program be dumped.

We recommended, however, that the Department conduct a five-year program to increase the natural fish production in large reservoirs and lakes because this would provide a wonderful supply of fish in this state.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Allen.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Madame Chairman, before we leave the area of Exhibit 33, directing your attention to several items in there, knowing the wonderful reputation of your firm, the 43% management cost, you fellows engaged in industrial fields, I imagine that struck you as rather peculiar at first flush.

MR. GRAY: In the Department of Fish and Game the term "management" is not the same as management in a normal industrial situation. Management in a normal industrial situation is better described by the functional area here of administration. Management and operation is the term used to describe the biological management which is largely a field installation problem in the Department of Fish and Game.

This term "management and operation" describes field activities.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Yes, but when you go back to the table of organization it looks rather weird where they have a

Captain and a Fish and Game Manager Grade I, Grade II and Grade III, and then they have one part-time employee.

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: It does look somewhat like a Mexican army or Chinese fire drill.

MR. GRAY: Well, I can't attest to whether it looks like those things, sir, but I certainly can say that we made definite recommendations to reduce the number of management levels within the Department and we appeared before a Senate Committee at which Chairman Davis was present in which we explained our recommendations on that point.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: In other words, when you talk about management, you lay it alongside your table of organizations and it looks almost like an attempt of a garbage collector to get the title of waste disposal engineer?

MR. GRAY: Certainly some of these things are titles of responsibilities which are not entirely that of supervising people. Some of them are biological titles of professional ability. I think that I have to make the point that the management and operation that we referred to here in Chart 33 includes the field activities and the field installations. This included the game management in the field, the fish management in the field, the game farms, the fish hatcheries and such things as the people that handled the fish screens and fish traps and the various field installations.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Getting away from somatics, you say

Semantics?

administration costs. How does the administration costs compare with the industrial organization, or do you have any comment?

MR. GRAY: We generally find it difficult to set down a percentage of general management that we can apply to any one company. In general, we found that, I think it was 14%, wasn't it, which was found to be the amount put to administration. Yes, it was 14%. We thought that this might be a little bit on the high side.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: I thought that 14% was on the research.

MR. GRAY: No, both administration and research were each respectively 14%.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Yet you show management and operation as 43%.

MR. GRAY: Yes and this, of course, this is the function of the Department. In other words, the administration is there for several purposes but specifically it is to lay the plans for organization, to execute the plans and to control the plans to see that they are carried through to proper completion.

And there are three major categories of effort in the Department. One is management and operation which is by far the largest. The second is law enforcement and the third is research. These are the working groups within the Department.

Now, conservation education, administration and miscellaneous are lesser jobs.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Well, you can understand what I am trying to get at, Mr. Gray. If I were to go out to one of my business

groups and say that the management costs of Fish and Game was 43%, there would be much lifting of eyebrows.

MR. GRAY: However, when you realize that we are talking about management as the administration for the most part and that is 14% and that includes the administration in all of the regions, in the headquarters and in the Commission, that figure is a lot less than this 43% up above here which compares much more with the manufacturing operation in an industrial concern or in a utility.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: What I am trying to point up to my colleagues is the enormous amount of interpolation you people had to do in this situation.

MR. GRAY: Well, we did. However, we found that we had lots of hooks on which we could hold as we went through this on the basis of definition and somatics. Once we got established as to what we meant by management and operations, then we had a way of setting up our analysis.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Of course, you indicated the job description and then the other situation. You first had to interpolate and that is time consuming.

MR. GRAY: We had some very definite recommendations in organization, Mr. Allen, which we felt were appropriate under these circumstances, and we recommended a reduction in the number of management levels within the Department.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: In other words, it is so much easier to go into an industrial plant where we have production reports,

cash registers and sales slips and adjudicate the actual value of any given position rather than the intangibles where we give service to the public.

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir. What we actually have proposed here, to carry along your analogy, we have proposed here a profit and loss statement for the Department which in any industrial situation takes your total income and then breaks it down normally by product line and in this case by program, the various fish and game programs, and then we have taken the expenditures in each one of these programs and found out how they came down to the bottom and produced either a profit or a loss.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: This will remove some of the guesswork.

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Thank you, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask one question? In your recommendations as to eliminating certain levels in management, how many personnel do you recommend to be eliminated? How many employees, 50?

MR. GRAY: Well, the net came to, as I recall, \$185,000. in salaries and expenses that could be eliminated through the recommended organizational changes that we had and this was referring entirely to organization and did not refer to some of the other cost reduction opportunities we felt existed.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Didn't you make any recommendations as to personnel numbers, how many of them were to be eliminated?

MR. GRAY: We identified the personnel that could be

eliminated as I remember - well, I think that if you would like to see our recommendations on that subject, it is on page 149 which summarizes our economies which could result from the elimination of certain organizational characteristics.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I know, but I am driving at the point of numbers of employees. What is the total?

MR. GRAY: Well, one specific - you are trying to make a simple situation out of a rather complex one, Mr. Thomas. We recommended, for instance, on page 150 that a total of twenty-four game managers, fishery managers and wildlife protection supervisors could be eliminated. This was part of the overall recommendation.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Fourteen game managers?

MR. GRAY: Yes, sir. Now, there were other additional ones. On page 149 we recommended the elimination of one regional headquarters and this would have meant \$125,000. in salaries and expenses. We did not identify the individuals involved there.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: So there are only twenty-four employees involved in your findings of savings?

MR. GRAY: Oh, no. I just said that we recommended the elimination of one regional headquarters with all of the management and secretarial, clerical people involved in one regional headquarters.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Now, will you tell me what is the total number of employees involved?

MR. GRAY: In the Department?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Yes.

MR. GRAY: Oh, there is something like one thousand in the Department.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I mean that you recommended be eliminated?

MR. GRAY: Well, sir, we did not recommend a specific number of employees to be eliminated. We recommended certain organizational changes. We identified positions that would be eliminated, we identified other expenses to be eliminated and we suggested that this would save \$186,000. to the Department. This is the result of organizational changes.

Now, we made other additional recommendations that will save several hundred thousand dollars in terms of reductions in costs in other operations such as the operations of game farms and fish hatcheries.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Thomas, probably - I am sure that as the other witnesses testify we will get into the portions of the subject matter that you have brought up. I sat in on the Senate Hearing where Mr. Gray testified relative to reorganization principally of the Department, and even though it is of prime interest to us, I don't think that our agenda here today will permit us to go into the reorganizational scope of this entire report. I made myself available at that time to sit in on the Senate Committee to listen to the explanation of this entire report based upon reorganization and I think in the future if we are desirous of going into that facet of it, we should do so in

combination with the committee of the Assembly on reorganization so that the two committees can meet together and discuss this fully.

I don't want to preclude anyone from having the information, and I have that thought in mind. As a matter of fact I have been discussing it with the staff.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Then, we are not discussing the entire report at this hearing?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: No, the part pertaining to the real costs to the sportsmen as far as the percentage totals, and that is the artificially raised trout program and the artificially raised pheasant program, and whether or not they are interested as outlined in the reports that you have received that our committee has submitted to you which are the departmental figures and itemized pagewise from the Governor's budget as whether or not the sportsmen wish to leave things financially status quo or whether they want to cut back in certain areas or whether they feel certain areas should be expanded upon. This is the purport of our meeting here today.

MR. GRAY: In our report we didn't attempt to set standards. We were not setting standards. However, I think the answer to Mr. Thomas' question which we are trying to answer, we did not recommend numbers of people as much as we set forth our recommendations in terms of dollars because we thought that what the State was interested in was dollars.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Your report states that 280 people are affected. I was just wondering what that meant. I wondered

whether that meant they were eliminated from their positions or changed around or had some transfer to some other part of the Department.

MR. GRAY: I don't remember, sir, that we made a statement concerning 280 people. Do you have that?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, it says here on page 150--

MR. GRAY: Oh, I see. I am sorry. I do understand what that comment referred to, sir. We were talking about creating a generalist category in the field. Each of the regions would be divided into districts and it was our recommendation based on our analysis of the work in the field that the categories of wildlife protection, the wardens, that is Fish and Game wardens, the work of the game managers, the work of the fishery managers, be combined into a generalist and the 280 positions we are talking about here are the various people that would be affected by our recommendation and there was a very possible upping of their classification as a result of this revision of their work.

Consequently, we provided in our analysis here the possible increase in salaries of 280 positions in the amount of \$100,000. and that was subtracted from the savings we thought could be brought about by our organization recommendations. That is why you see the 280, sir. I am sorry, I misunderstood your point.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions of Mr. Gray? I think probably Mr. Shannon has something to say.

MR. SHANNON: I don't have any particular questions at this time. I just want to say whereas we furnished much data to

the Booz, Allen and Hamilton people on this survey, and this is reiterating what Mr. Gray said, we did not have the opportunity to discuss their conclusions or their recommendations before the report was issued. Consequently, we feel that in some cases they didn't interpret the figures correctly. In many cases they made very good recommendations which we are carrying out and they are putting into practice.

After the report was issued we made an attempt formally to discuss the whole report with them so that we could arrive at some understanding as to what they meant in certain instances and they felt that their contract had been completed and their men were busy and the opportunity did not arise for this mutual discussion. So I don't have any particular questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, Mr. Shannon, then are you saying that you agree with their recommendations? You may differ with figures but what is your position on the recommendations pertaining to trout, for instance, if we can stay with that at this particular time?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, if you get down to specific recommendations, I think we can answer. Are you talking about the catchable trout program?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is correct, the wild trout program also and the recommendations that they have specified here as far as the enhancement of natural habitat in lakes and streams which they feel will take care of the increased population to serve them as far as trout is concerned.

MR. SHANNON: Our recommendation as far as the catchable trout program is concerned is reflected by the proposed policy that we submitted to the Commission two or three months ago and which is now under consideration by the Commission. This would set a ceiling on the expenditure of the catchable trout program which would be related to the sale of license stamps and to the number of fishermen who fish for trout. This would approximate the amount that we are spending on the program at the present time.

If there should be an increase in the number of trout fishermen, then there would be a corresponding increase in the expenditures as far as the catchable trout program was concerned. This policy is now before the Commission.

As far as wild trout and also warm water fish are concerned, we feel very much as this report expresses, that increased emphasis should be placed on habitat improvement. We have done some and we are doing some in our 1960-61 budget, proposing expenditures which would materially emphasize and extend habitat improvement projects.

We have a proposed warm water reservoir study which is somewhere in the amount of \$70,000. for 1960-61, which we believe over a period of time will produce results which will be of great benefit to the anglers in the state.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by the members of the committee? If not, will you proceed with the game program?

MR. GRAY: May I make one statement regarding Mr. Shannon's

comment that we did not have the opportunity to get together. He perhaps was not aware of the fact that the Director of the Department of Fish and Game at that time called us. We expressed our willingness to get together with the Department of Fish and Game after our report was submitted. We told them that we would be happy to, that we maintained certain funds available to be used against that particular task. We did this in writing to the Director at that time.

Subsequently about three weeks later we had heard nothing from the Department and there were no arrangements made to get together and our client terminated our contract and recalled all funds that were not already used in our work, and consequently we had to write the Department that we were not in a position to expend any more of the project money against working with them, so this went on with the Director at that time.

We were looking at Note D, regarding hunting license allocations.

"1. The revenue from sale of hunting licenses was distributed to the various game management programs on the basis of hunting effort as revealed by the most current data available.

"2. The total hunting license revenue was allocated to the following programs on the basis of man days spent by hunting license buyers on each of these categories in 1957 as revealed by the Department's questionnaire to a representative group of such hunters:

"Big game, 45.7%; water fowl, 11.5%; other upland game,

31.6%; pheasant, 11.2%." The total is 100%.

"3. The amount of pheasant hunting effort was further divided between pheasant raised to maturity on state farms and all other pheasant in the ratio of 10% and 90%, respectively. This ratio was based upon the Department's estimate of the bag of the two classes of pheasant in 1956."

Consequently, this gave us our division of this \$1,858,005 income from hunting licenses across the various game management programs, including the division of 10% to raised pheasants and 90% to wild pheasants.

The deer and bear tags amount to a total of \$445,127 which all went to big game. And the pheasant tags were distributed on the basis of 10% and 90%. The special big game hunts income was \$28,230 which all went to big game.

The controlled hunt area permits amounted to \$106,505 which was primarily water fowl and went to the water fowl program.

Deer meat permits amounted to \$10,506 which went to the big game program.

Commercial hunt clubs primarily the pheasants, was divided on the 10% raised; 90% wild. Guide and trapper licenses and miscellaneous, which was a very small amount of money, but still sufficient to recognize here, being \$9,850, was involved in Note E.

"1. Guide and trapping licenses, and miscellaneous license, permit and tag revenues were allocated to major programs on the ratio of all other license, permit and tag income:

"Big game, 16.55%; water fowl, 3.98%; pheasant - raised, .83%; pheasant - wild, 7.45%; other upland game, 7.30%; trout - catchable, 8.19%; trout - wild, 19.49%; warm water fish, 11.08%; steelhead, 1.58%; salmon, 1.82%; striped bass, 5.94%."

The next group are on the marine side of things:

"Salmon, .60%; tuna, 2.03%; bottom fish, 8.55%; shellfish, .29%; pelagic fish, .16%; other sports fish, 4.16%." This totals 100%.

"2. Commissions paid to license agents were also distributed to programs on these same ratios." So that Note E applies to the credit for commissions. Now, the general taxes such as fish tax, amount to \$297,056 and our distribution was according to Note F.

"Inasmuch as fish taxes are levied on a weight basis, the general fish tax revenue was allocated to the various major marine fish programs (exclusive of salmon) on the basis of the poundage of the 1956 commercial fish landings in California:

"Tuna, 55.5%; pelagic fish, 36.7%; bottom fish, 4.5%; shellfish, 3.3%." That totals 100%.

The salmon tax went directly to the salmon program. The kelp harvester and shellfish went to the shellfish program; the privilege taxes went entirely to the pelagic fish.

Now, the miscellaneous income was divided according to Note G.

"Miscellaneous marine fish revenues were allocated on the ratio of the estimated 1957-58 commercial revenues as determined

below:

"Salmon, 6.23%; tuna, 39.81%; bottom fish, 3.23%; shellfish, 3.69%; pelagic fish, 47.04%." The total is 100%.

The court fines were allocated on the basis of Note H.

"Court fines and interest on investments were allocated to the various major programs on the ratio of the total estimated 1957-58 revenue as distributed in this schedule:

"Big game, 15.63%; water fowl, 3.75%; pheasant - raised, .78%; pheasant - wild, 7.03%; other upland game, 6.89%; trout - catchable, 7.73%; trout - wild, 18.40%; warm water fish, 10.46%; steelhead, 1.49%; salmon, 1.72%; striped bass, 5.61%."

The following are under the marine fishery.

"Salmon, .92%; tuna, 4.15%; bottom fish, 8.25%; shellfish, .48%; pelagic fish, 2.79%; other sports fish, 3.92%." This totals 100%.

Now, this left only one other category in our chart which needed allocation and that was the federal funds.

"Federal funds made available under the provisions of the Dingell - Johnson and Pittman - Robertson Acts were allocated to the various programs of the ratio of the actual expenditures on such projects during 1957-58:

"Big game, 19.9%; water fowl, 42.4%; pheasant - wild, 2.7%; pheasant - raised, 1.5%; other upland game, 11.3%; trout - wild, 3.8%; trout - catchable, 3.6%; warm water fish, 1.8%; steelhead, 4.7%; salmon, 1.7%; striped bass, 1.4%."

In the marine fisheries:

"Salmon, .3%; other sports fish, 4.9%." This makes a total of 100%.

Now, the totals that we have across the bottom here then show the revenue for the various categories of game and inland fishery and marine fishery programs. We drew these significant conclusions from our chart, Exhibit 34, as shown on page 161 here from the standpoint of general wildlife programs.

"Game management and inland fish activities each contributed approximately 40% of total revenues, and marine fish activities contributed approximately 20% in 1957-58."

It is interesting that these contributions in terms of totals are very similar to the expenditures, the conclusions that we reached over on page 160, but from the viewpoint of specific wildlife programs the combined wild and raised trout programs contributed almost 25% of the Department's total revenues in 1957-58, of which 17% was contributed by the wild trout program and 8% by the raised trout program.

"The big game program contributed approximately 16% of the Department's total revenues in 1957-58.

"The water fowl program contributed approximately 8% of the Department's 1957-58 revenues.

"All other programs contributed approximately 51% of the Department's 1957-58 revenues."

"The comparison of 1957-58 expenditures and revenues by major wildlife programs provides an excellent basis for developing further meaningful management control information. Certainly

the relationship of expenditures to revenue with respect to specific wildlife programs provides a more informative basis for evaluation of programs.

"Another use of such a comparison is the evaluation of license fee levels in relation to the programs being maintained. It is logical that the extent each program is self-supporting should be one of the important factors in evaluating the proper license levels."

"Exhibit 35, which follows, presents the comparison of estimated expenditures and revenues for 1957-58." That is shown on page 163.

"The qualifications presented earlier apply, of course, to this comparison." Those qualifications are that our figures are not absolute, but they are generally reliable.

"Before enumerating the significant conclusions, it is important to call attention to the fact that these analyses relate to 1957-58 actual conditions. It should be remembered that certain license fees were in process of being raised and that the full effect of such an increase was not reflected in 1957-58 revenue.

"Angling stamps were effective January 1, 1958, contributing \$1,081,668 in the second half of the fiscal year. Increases in the basic hunting license and deer tag fees were approved but not effective until July 1, 1958, thereby not being reflected in fiscal 1957-58. These facts should be kept in mind when evaluating the conclusions.

"With this in mind, the following general conclusions are valid and significant.

"1. In general each of the three broad classes of wildlife programs are self-supporting. Although game program expenditures exceeded related revenues by \$365,000 in 1957-58, it is expected that the increased hunting fees effective July 1, 1958, will more than offset this amount.

"Inland fish revenues exceeded costs of inland fish programs by approximately \$200,000, which would have been greater had the angling stamp revenue been in effect for the full fiscal year.

"Marine fish revenues lagged approximately \$600,000 behind related program costs. However, it is to be pointed out that approximately \$297,000 in major capital outlays were allocated to marine fish programs in the 1957-58 expenditures. These represented the purchase of a replacement for the patrol boat 'Albacore' and a pro-rata share of a new Department airplane. Although major capital outlays do recur from time to time, the marine fish programs experienced unusually large expenditures for capital outlays in 1957-58.

"2. In general, the two programs in which both wild and artificially propagated wildlife are involved are self-supporting in total.

"Approximately \$875,000 was expended on the combined pheasant program in 1957-58, and related revenues approximated \$710,000. However, the increased basic hunting license fees should be expected to offset perhaps half of this differential.

"The combined trout revenues contributed approximately \$2,400,000 as compared to combined program costs of approximately \$2,600,000. The full effect of angling stamps may be expected to offset this differential.

"3. It is clearly evident that although the trout and pheasant programs are each substantially self-supporting in total, in both cases the artificial programs are being very significantly supported by the wild species programs.

"The 'put-and-take' pheasant program contributes only approximately \$100,000 in revenues, whereas the program costs approach \$600,000.

"The catchable trout program contributed approximately \$725,000 in revenues, whereas the program costs are almost \$2,000,000.

"4. Certain wildlife species generate revenues considerably in excess of their related expenditures because the species are popular but require relatively little in the way of management at this time. Striped bass, warm water fish and bottom fish are in this category.

"5. On the other hand, other species are presently generating less revenue than the cost of programs in 1957-58. Steelhead, salmon, shellfish, and pelagic fish are in this category."

If you will refer to page 163 where you will find our charts, you can see that the answer to the question as to whether or not revenue offsets expenditure for the various

programs can be found in the last four columns on the right of the page. You can see that total expenditures for big game were \$1,373,668 and the revenues were \$1,553,049. Percentagewise it was 12.9% of expenditures against 15.7% of revenues. And that comparison runs all the way down the page until you see down at the bottom the grand totals, and there is also a way of comparing how the management and operation, law enforcement, conservation education, administration, research, miscellaneous expenditures total up to the total for expenditures.

Perhaps there may be questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Are there any questions by members of the committee? Sometimes you lose probably a few of us around one of these corners when you go into these percentages, Mr. Gray, because I know it is very difficult to follow these charts and you are familiar with them where you actually did the work. Does the Department have any comments to make on this? Are there any questions of Mr. Gray relative to the percentages that have been quoted here? Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: They are not exactly questions. We disagree in some instances on how they arrived at the revenues, how they determined them.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Will you emphasize the specific things when you say "instances" so that we can have a comparison?

MR. SHANNON: Well, for instance, where the estimate of revenue is made on the amount of money that is brought in by the catchable trout program, I think he said that 8% of the revenue

was brought by the catchable trout program, and this was based on the number of catchable trout that end up in the angler's creel. We cannot agree with this evaluation or basis for estimating revenue because you can't really determine when a man buys a fishing license and buys two stamps whether he intends to fish for wild trout or catchable trout or both, and maybe in many cases he doesn't know.

Now, if Mr. Gray and I should go fishing in catchable trout waters and we read that in some of these streams near Sacramento they are planting catchable trout, for instance, and we say, "Let's go. It looks like we might catch a limit or have pretty good luck." He buys a license with stamps and I buy a license with stamps. We both go out. The desire there and the urge to go is originated by the fact that we are planting catchable trout. Now, he catches a limit of fish. I don't catch any. Because he caught a limit of fish his revenue is included in there, but I don't catch any so my revenue is not included. We both went with the same idea, to fish and with the possibility of catching catchable trout.

So in many many cases a person, his idea of going is generated by the thought of catching catchable trout. In many many cases he doesn't catch any but the license and the stamps are sold on that basis. Yet, in arriving at this revenue, the man who catches nothing, his revenue is not included.

Now, this same thing applies to pheasants. In other words, on our cooperative areas, many people go there because they know that the Department plants adult birds. Some have luck, some

don't. But the idea is there and is fostered by the thought that the game farms are planting birds there. Then quite a few people get nothing, but the idea is there. The reason they go is because the State is planting large pheasants there. Yet, that revenue is not included, is not attributed to the game farm program you might say. These are things that we could have discussed with Booz, Allen and Hamilton prior to the time their report came out. We realize that in this case it wasn't possible to do so, but because of that in many cases we don't go along with some of the conclusions they reached in the evaluation of revenues and expenditures.

Probably we go along better with their evaluations on expenditures than we do with their evaluation on the revenues that the various programs bring in.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Mr. Shannon, what in your opinion would happen to the wild trout fishery if the catchable trout program were discontinued?

MR. SHANNON: There would be one or two things. Either there would be much more pressure exerted on the wild trout fishery or a lot of people wouldn't buy licenses. They would drop out of the trout picture. They wouldn't think it would be worth their while to buy a trout license.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: So therefore, there might be some variance in the allocation of revenues, we will say, and the expenditure. It might have an indirect effect. It might be allocated to the catchable program and it might have an indirect

benefit on the other?

MR. SHANNON: This is very true and I think one thing that we have to guard against and be careful about is trying to tie expenditures to revenues in the management of the fish and game programs. Now, granted that in many cases it provides good information and good controls for the management of a program, but you can't go too far with this because we are faced with the responsibility of managing certain species which without any question don't bring in any revenue. What are we going to do with those? What are we going to do with all the protected birds, with the condors, the big-horned sheep and cases like that where you can't say they bring in any revenue?

Licenses aren't sold. They aren't hunted. We have to provide for those. And to try to divide, for instance, in the case of trout, to try to divide and say that the amount of revenue that is brought in by the whole trout program, 8% is a result of catchable trout and 17% is the result of the wild trout program, is extremely difficult to do, and as I just tried to point out, intelligent people can argue and present strong arguments as to why it shouldn't be judged on the basis of what ends up in the angler's creel.

On the other hand, Mr. Gray can present a good argument as to why they did this. So it is not a case where black is black and white is white. There is just a lot of gray in between.

MR. GRAY: That's not me.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, may I ask you, since you

specified actually it isn't too feasible to judge these programs according to the revenue received, isn't that what you stated as far as the output of these programs relative to the revenues you receive is concerned?

MR. SHANNON: What I meant, perhaps I didn't state it clearly and it is a little difficult to state, that we should not try in all cases to balance the amount of money expended on any particular species or program in accordance with the amount of revenue brought in.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Isn't this exactly what you are advocating in your new trout policy to the Commission as far as the staff is concerned?

MR. SHANNON: This is more true in relation to what is termed the artificial programs such as the catchable trout program and the pheasant program. We feel in the case of the trout program, that it is a good program and that generally throughout the State most people want the catchable trout program. We feel that a ceiling should be placed on it which ties pretty much to our best estimate of the number of people who engage in this particular thing, but when you get into the wild programs and away from these artificial programs which can be judged a little bit better on the basis of revenue and expenditures, when you get into these other fields, it is difficult and we can't go too far because when you do, you don't make provision for a lot of things we have to do.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Let me ask you, is your

concept on the catchable program one of conservation or is it definitely in your opinion a "put-and-take" situation?

MR. SHANNON: Well, our catchable trout program is pretty much a "put-and-take" program. We raise catchable trout for the benefit of the angler. We try to do so in a way that will provide the biggest return to the angler and at the same time furnish as much sport as possible, but we want to see most of our catchable trout end up in the angler's creel and we work on that basis because if we didn't these fish would cost a lot more than they do.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, then in view of that, it is in your opinion definitely in the scope of a "put-and-take" program. Is it not true or would it be in your opinion that it is then a phase of recreation more than conservation?

MR. SHANNON: It is certainly recreation, Mrs. Davis, and in some cases it is conservation, too, because as I earlier stated, when we provide these catchable trout, we do take a lot of pressure off other waters that would be overrun if we didn't do this. So in effect it is conservation to the extent that it relieves the pressure on some of the wild populations. It is definitely a part of recreation and it is a "put-and-take" program, but in spite of all these things, our evaluation of the thing is that generally throughout the state, more particularly in the south, not so true in the north, that the people are in favor of the program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. De Lotto.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: Mr. Shannon, I had two questions.

You answered one, but I wanted a little clarification. In looking at Exhibit 35 on page 163 we have the estimated expenditures and the revenues as prepared for this report. Do you have any kind of comparable percentage column like this on expenditures and revenues within your Department or are these identical to the figures that you have in expenditures?

MR. SHANNON: In the first place, we don't have a comparable chart, Mr. De Lotto, and not knowing what Mr. Gray was going to present today we couldn't match up with his testimony. But, as I say, we would not go along with all these figures. We furnished much of the data, but our conclusions are different in some cases and a little later in our presentation we will touch on some of these things and what we think they cost in relation to the revenue.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: All right. One more question along that same line. In light of having this report this past fiscal year, did you modify or attempt to develop for the 1958-59 fiscal year some sort of a comparison along this kind of analogy here?

MR. SHANNON: We are in the process of evaluating all the recommendations of Booz, Allen and Hamilton. This is quite a job. As you know, it took about two years, and it is taking us quite awhile to do it, too, because you analyze their recommendations you in effect are doing the whole thing over again from our standpoint. So we haven't since this came out, we haven't gone through and done the same thing that they have, so I can't give

you the comparable figures in relation to what they have just presented. In some cases we can. I don't have them right with me now, but in some cases we can give you our evaluation on certain programs. I might say this, that after Mrs. Davis' bill passed in the last session to establish a cost accounting system, we established that system and we have just come out with our first quarterly report.

Now, our 1955 estimate of our expenditures was a one-shot proposition. Mr. Gray mentioned that. Their figures here are a one-shot proposition. The cost system that has been established is a continual system that will go on and on and we will have figures, quarterly figures, annual figures, upon which we can compare these figures and this system is much more extensive than either what we did before or what the Booz, Allen and Hamilton people did, and we hold great promise in this system.

It will give us a control. It will give us indications of where we should perhaps alter the emphasis, but we won't necessarily say that if you get this much out of this you have to spend this much, because you can't apply that in all the wildlife programs in the State.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: You will agree, however, it is a healthy thing that we actually do see what the expenditures are and what the revenues are in each program?

MR. SHANNON: I think it is very good. It is certainly going to give management an indication after an evaluation of whether we are going too far in one direction or not far enough

in the other. Certainly, it is a very good tool for management.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: It is also good for the sportsmen and the public in general?

MR. SHANNON: And everybody else.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by the members of the committee or Mr. Gray, particularly? If not, as this time I think that we will complete your testimony, Mr. Gray, unless you have some concluding comments that you would like to make?

MR. GRAY: I do. I would like to just further sum up this.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right.

MR. GRAY: My testimony will continue following the outline of the report. Down at the bottom of page 162 we say, "Great care should be taken not to base evaluations of programs revenues and costs on the basis of a single year's experience. It should be continually kept in mind that very considerable efforts may be required to determine the causes of declines in natural resources and that such effort is not necessarily related to current revenues attributed to that resource. This is particularly true with respect to solving the unknowns of marine fisheries.

"The development of cost and revenue analyses of this type provides an additional factual base upon which to determine policy and program decisions and to provide management with data by which to control the Department's efforts."

This follows along the discussion just a moment ago. We look at this as a management tool and our recommendations are along the lines of providing management tools. We recommend on

page 164 to install and maintain revenue and cost controls on a continuing basis. "It is clear that revenue and cost control produces four significant benefits:

"Provides additional facts upon which to base policy and program decisions.

"Presents management control information upon which to judge and evaluate departmental performance against approved policies and programs.

"Furnishes added factual data which would facilitate a clearer understanding in the minds of the Legislature, the sportsmen and the general public.

"Offers factual data upon which to evaluate the proper levels of license fees, particularly with respect to artificial programs."

So conclusions on revenue and cost analysis should be based on several years' experience. I think that is self-evident. Our recommendations follow. Develop more detailed and refined revenue and cost control. Use the cost accounting system to supplement budgetary accounting.

Identify costs both as to major wildlife programs and as to significant subfunctions within a major wildlife function.

Identify revenues to the same wildlife programs used for cost breakdowns.

Require daily time reporting of all department personnel except those whose activities fall into a general or administrative category.

Classify other costs into those which are generally related to personnel activity and those which are identifiable to programs and functions.

Develop quantitative measures of performance in order to facilitate evaluation of programs and results.

Prepare cost accounting reports on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis.

All control reports should be prepared by the centralized accounting department.

And a general statement that Mr. Shannon made that they are proceeding already to install a cost accounting program would seem to us to perform the basis or foundation on which to set up this revenue and cost analysis which we have in Table 35, page 163.

Now, this concludes our testimony on this particular subject. Are there any further questions on the subject?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well evidently not, Mr. Gray. Just for a moment I want to ask the committee before we recess for lunch, there is a gentleman in the audience who is a member of the sportsmen's organizations that would like to have a picture of this committee. Is there any objection? It would be a flash bulb type of thing. No objection. He better hurry along because we are going to recess for lunch until 1:30. That doesn't give us too much time. We have a terrific agenda and I am sure you are going to be interested in the testimony this afternoon from the sportsmen's organizations on these subject matters. I want to call to the attention of all the witnesses now under oath that you are

directed to appear before this committee when it reconvenes at one-thirty.

(Thereupon the noon recess was taken.)

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1960, 1:30 O'CLOCK, P.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We are going to have to proceed in the essence of time while the rest of the members are coming in. At this particular time I would like to have Mr. Shannon, who has requested an opportunity to say a few words, and I hope, Mr. Shannon, that in view of that you can possibly achieve this in twenty minutes, because we do have some people that have to leave by three o'clock, and we want to accommodate them.

MR. SHANNON: I will try to do that in twenty minutes. Shannon is my name, representing the Department of Fish and Game. This opportunity to present information on a series of questions submitted to us by your Chairman, Mrs. Davis, is most appreciated. The keynote which Mrs. Davis set in stating that the hearing would be conducted "ona foundation of impartial constructive thought based on factual information" is an excellent one and will be followed to the best of our ability and availability of factual information.

Last month your Chairman requested that we develop material on a number of programs and activities.

And this presentation is based pretty much on those questions. Before I get into that, however, I would like to say again that the Department is making public for the first time the complete detail of the figures developed in the first quarter of the new cost accumulation system which was implemented by legislation sponsored by Mrs. Davis. The figures in our report developed

from detailed time reports of our field and office people, we believe, are the most complete factual figures on individual programs which we have ever had.

In the past much confusion has been created by attempts to break down whole budget figures in a variety of ways. The problems resulting from such breakdown attempts including some made by the Department have resulted from the fact that a variety of bases for evaluation have been used with no common understanding of the frame of reference or the basic weaknesses of the procedures involved.

For the first time then we are now looking forward to being able to answer program cost figures factually rather than on the basis of arbitrary guesses and interpretations in some cases guided by casual questionnaires or personal opinions.

The cost estimates we have had in the past were the best which could be developed at the time with the facilities and data available. We hope that in the future our actual expenditure figures will take the place of these less reliable figures which have been used in the past.

As a preface to the specific information which follows, I would like briefly to review events of the past year which have a bearing on the subjects under discussion by this committee.

Two weeks ago I was appointed Director of the Department by Governor Edmund G. Brown, succeeding Mr. William E. Warne, who had served as Director since last April. A number of the matters I will discuss here, including policies suggested to the Commission, the

cost accounting system implemented by legislation sponsored by Mrs. Davis, programs and projects of a five-year wildlife conservation program all were inaugurated under Mr. Warne's direction.

The Governor has now given me the responsibility of administering the Department in accordance with his overall goal of economy, efficiency and progress in state government. I intend to follow through with the sound courses already set as well as to seek and put into effect other administrative and operational plans and procedures which will contribute toward economy, improved efficiency and effective wildlife conservation activities.

Traditionally and by law, this agency has been charged with a variety of responsibilities, all broadly encompassing the general welfare of California fish and wildlife.

In reviewing these responsibilities in the Fish and Game Code recently, I have been impressed with the fact that the Legislature over the years generally has looked at these resources as a whole entity and has not endeavored to fix the revenue raising ability of a resource as its justification for being protected and maintained by this agency.

We are charged with protecting all species of wildlife, and providing information and other services to all citizens of California whether or not these species or these people contribute directly to the revenue of the fish and game preservation fund.

Department programs for wildlife conservation have been developed on the basis of need of the various species. Artificial propagation programs had their original base in the need of a

species, but as they have grown by popular demand it is essential to evaluate costs of the programs so that they will not absorb other less popular, but necessary conservation programs of the agency.

The cost accounting figures available at the end of this fiscal year on expenditures should give us the first complete series of facts on our programs.

As your committee reviews departmental programs and activities of the past, the influence of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report on the agency during the past year should be noted. On December 10, 1959, just a year after the report was issued, the Director reported to the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources that "a great majority of the more than two hundred Booz, Allen and Hamilton recommendations have been put into effect or in progress." He added that the results have been worthwhile and I agree.

I would add at this time that a review of the current status of each Booz, Allen and Hamilton recommendation is under way and an evaluation will be made by the Department within the next few weeks.

You might be interested, although you haven't requested it, in the latest reports on license sales as of December 31, 1959.

The downward trend of hunting licenses experienced in 1957 and 1958 appears to have leveled off on the basis of the record of the past six months. A total of 501,931 hunting licenses were sold, an increase of 572 over the same six months of the preceeding

year. An increase of 1,271 junior licenses and a decrease of 923 adult licenses accounted for a slight revenue drop of \$1,388, however.

Deer tags jumped 7,585, bear tags increased 1,716, but pheasant tags dropped 8,259.

Angling license sales continued to increase over the previous year by 72,953. We issued more free licenses too, for a total of 16,248.

Reported sales of angling license stamps were off 16,657 but we anticipate this deficit will eventually show an increase when reports are all in because there are about 85,000 more stamps unreported by license agents at this time than at the same time last year.

In summary we believe we will see a slight increase in hunting revenues for the first time in three years and a continued steady increase in angling revenues.

Turning now to the eleven specific questions which Mrs. Davis presented to us on December 28, 1959, I will endeavor to provide detailed factual information as requested and the material is identified by alphabetical letters in the same order as the questions were submitted.

One of the questions was, what are your anticipated 1959-60 revenues, and rather than go into this in detail I will say that our total net revenue amounts to \$10,799,649. Adding Pittman-Robertson, which are the funds received from the Federal Government of \$991,661 and the federal aid, Dingell-Johnson federal aid program

of \$257,625, we come up with a grand total revenue of \$12,048,935.

In consideration of the pheasant program and in relation to the question asked concerning whether the program which provides artificially raised pheasants for under-the-gun planting is self supporting, we are of the belief that any estimates we might make in relation thereto would have to be made on unprecise factors which could result in errors one way or the other.

We know of no practical way of dividing pheasant hunting revenue between wild and raised birds, so are unable to discuss the pheasant program on the basis of division of cost alone.

It is our position expressed last Friday to the Commission, that basically the Department's continuance of an under-the-gun pheasant raising program is undesirable from the wildlife conservation point of view. We have been working on the new proposed policy for more than six months. Put-and-take shooting is appropriate in nonhabitat areas only, and only as an activity of private enterprise. The Booz, Allen and Hamilton report concurs.

In consideration of the trout program, the Department has recommended a policy to the Commission which would place a financial floor under, and a ceiling over the trout hatchery program.

We know of no equitable way of dividing angling revenue between wild trout and catchables on the basis of license and stamp sales which they individually generate.

We took the following facts and figures available and developed the base on which our proposed policy was drawn.

I think you people have the chart here so I won't go into that, but it does point out that if the people who benefit from this program, if that money is used, it will just about pay the cost of the catchable trout program.

The estimated number of trout anglers is based on a 20-year record of research interviews and postcard surveys of license buyers which indicate that about half of all the angling license buyers fish for trout.

The license stamp initially was suggested to the Legislature as a means of financing the trout hatchery program. We found that actual revenues from stamps purchased by the estimated number of anglers who fish for trout approximates the existing expenditures for raising and planting trout.

Our proposed policy suggests that this relationship between stamp sales and the scope of the trout hatchery program be maintained, recognizing that more and more areas of the State are feeling increasing pressures on trout waters as trout angler pressure progresses northward with increasing demands upon the Department to plant more fish to provide reasonable fishing success.

Under this formula, as more trout anglers put more pressure on trout waters, we would put resulting stamp revenues into catchable trout. If anglers decrease and pressures and revenues decline, cutbacks would be made in the same ratio.

We believe control of the catchable trout program under the proposed policy will provide an equitable working plan.

In relation to the 1960-61 budget, which is a part of the Governor's Budget or the Governor's Budget which has not as yet been announced, I might say, even though it hasn't been announced, we are prepared to discuss with you our proposals which did call for increase in level of some services and programs.

The proposals for increases we have made generally are those programs which we listed as needing improvement in 1957 when the Fish and Game Commission and Department asked the Legislature for increased revenues, which you granted us.

In relation to the use of so-called "frozen funds", we have approached this on the basis that such funds required to cover the proposed budget, which are duly appropriated by the Legislature, become unfrozen by that act. This approach was adopted after consultation with the offices of the Legislative Analyst and the Department of Finance.

Whatever the action of the Governor and the Legislature is in relation to our 1960-61 proposed budget and its relation to so-called "frozen funds", we do not anticipate that any license increase would be necessary within the foreseeable future to provide for the anticipated needs of a sound wildlife conservation program.

We estimate a working surplus of \$4,269,861 in the Fish and Game preservation fund on June 30, 1960, the end of the current fiscal year. Of this, \$3,734,494 comprises the so-called accumulation "frozen funds" and \$535,367 the so-called "unfrozen" working capital.

If all our budget proposal were adopted for the 1960-61 fiscal year, and our total revenue estimates, including so-called "frozen funds" continue true, revenues will cover all operations and maintenance. The only proposed draft on accumulated funds would be in the amount of approximately \$760,000 for one-time capital outlay expenditures.

This would leave an estimated fish and game preservation fund balance of \$3,738,697 at the end of the 1960-61 fiscal year.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, may I ask you a question there? You are considering in order to be able to make this statement the use of the frozen fund monies?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, we are contemplating use of the frozen money.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think this should be made very clear. I think some people generally have the opinion that the only way these frozen monies could be released would be by a special bill to so indicate what these funds would be expended for, but that is not the case as you have stated and that is, that merely the adoption of this program in the Governor's Budget releases these frozen funds, right?

MR. SHANNON: Adoption by the Legislature of the Governor's Budget.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is correct. So actually if you were not to use these frozen funds, what would be your financial status for the next fiscal year as far as revenue is concerned? Would you actually be in a hazardous position?

MR. SHANNON: If we were not to use frozen funds, we would probably have to cut back.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You would probably have to cut back or ask for an increase in license fees which you do not propose to do?

MR. SHANNON: Of course, in proposing our budget, we took into account, as I mentioned, the areas where we indicated we would expand or put increase emphasis if we got a license increase and we followed that plan pretty much assuming that that is what the sportsmen wanted and what they felt was the area that we should put more effort into.

In reference to the financial crisis of the marine research committee which Mrs. Davis mentioned in her letter, this is being met during the current and coming fiscal year by reducing programs back to a level of expenditures within the anticipated income. During the previous two fiscal years revenues were greater and the committee materially expanded its program utilizing accumulated surpluses.

The marine research committee has reported to the Director that a return to its expanded program is desirable but not possible in view of its reduced reserve income. At its meeting last month, the committee considered the possibility of widening its revenue base by several means. These included an increase in the tax on those species now taxed, adding other species to those now taxed, looking for other sources such as grants from foundations or the Federal Government, and seeking support from the State's general fund.

The committee has not finished its evaluation of the situation nor has it made any recommendation upon which I would base my judgment as Director as to which avenue should be followed.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask a question? What is the crisis of the marine research committee? How much deficit is there, if there is a deficit?

MR. SHANNON: There is a deficit. I would like to call on Harry Anderson here to give you the situation better than I can.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Madame Chairman, and members of the committee, I do not have the specific figures here, but the revenue as I recall is approximately \$50,000 less than what was anticipated. Therefore, the program will be underfinanced by approximately that amount. They will have to curtail this year's program. They are also estimating a continuation at the reduced level for next year.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: There is a \$50,000 deficit?

MR. ANDERSON: I recall that is the approximate figure. Is it more than that in total? I would be glad to pick those figures up and give you the further detail later if you would wish.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, I believe that possibly we should have them. You are interested in having that specifically, aren't you, Mr. Thomas?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, you call it a financial crisis. I was wondering, what is the crisis.

MR. SHANNON: The crisis is the fact they are spending more money than they are taking in by quite a little bit, quite a sizeable percentage when you look at their total budget.

In relation to ocean anglers and what they get, we approached the question of whether the ocean angler is "getting his money's worth" by estimating revenues in two ways. One, on a minimum basis, then on a maximum basis.

Our conclusion is that the ocean sports angler is receiving attention and service commensurate with the general levels of revenues which he provides.

The Department's 1955 economic survey, based on written interviews of a random sample of license buyers, indicated that 11.7% of all sport angling license buyers fish in salt water only. There is no evidence to indicate that this percentage has changed materially since 1955.

For the 1959-60 fiscal year, 11.7% of the estimated angling license revenue totals \$525,513. This provides the minimum base of our estimated ocean revenue.

Postcard surveys have indicated that approximately 25% of all California angling effort is spent on the ocean. On this maximum basis, 25% of sports license angling sales equals \$1,125,000.

Actually, we have no means of determining what marine resource work benefits sports or commercial fisheries separately. Although some phases of the work are directed primarily toward one or the other, the overall effect is for the benefit and protection of marine resources as a whole. For this reason we add the revenues

from commercial fisheries sources which are estimated at \$558,000 with the agent's commission deducted to each of the estimates from sports anglers and find a minimum revenue of \$1,083,000 or a maximum of \$1,683,000 from ocean fishing, sports, and commercial.

Turning next to expenditures, marine resources branch and operations activities this year will cost an estimated \$1,046,000. Marine patrol will cost about \$500,000 or a total of \$1,546,000. Ocean fishermen, particularly salmon anglers, benefit from expenditures made for pollution control, water projects activities and salmon management accomplished by various regions. The amounts expended for these purposes, as well as for a share of headquarters administration, conservation education and similar items which are a part of the overall cost of all departmental programs also are items for which the ocean angler has a share, in an unknown quantity.

Excluding these, then we find our known expenditures of \$1,546,000 are between the minimum and maximum estimates of revenues from ocean sources, and upon this base our conclusion.

In other words, we spend \$1,546,000 on a minimum estimate and \$1,083,000 as brought in on a maximum estimate of \$1,683,000. So what we are spending is in between these two.

In reference to warm water fish, with the increasing numbers of warm water reservoirs anticipated as a part of the implementation of the California Water Plan, as well as the existing obvious need to make existing warm waters more productive, we have developed a plan to step up warm water fisheries work.

A part of this plan already is in operation. Recently we have introduced threadfin shad into northern California waters, after its previous successful introduction and subsequent research in southern California waters. In addition, we have introduced striped bass into Millerton Lake and the Colorado River and we brought walleyed pike into the State for southern California waters.

We are continuing our research as well as experiments to find ways of improving warm water fishing. We have no basis on which to estimate the approximate numbers of anglers who seek warm water fish, but we recognize this area as of increasing importance.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask you a question there, Mr. Shannon? What sum, if you recall, are you requesting for the enhancement of warm water fishing in this fiscal budget?

MR. SHANNON: In reference to the warm water reservoir program or the reservoir program, I believe it is in the neighborhood of \$70,000. It is approximately \$70,000.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And any additional staff?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, there are additional people involved in this.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How many would it take?

MR. SHANNON: Do you know offhand?

MR. ANDERSON: I will have it in a minute here.

MR. CALHOUN: It might interest the committee that this is an offset from a federal aid program on catchable trout which we are winding up, so that is a new program using funds that were

previously used for something else.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I realize that, but now the question I am asking is relative to the increasing staff for the enhancement of warm water fisheries.

MR. CALHOUN: Approximately ten positions.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In what capacity?

MR. CALHOUN: Here I am going by memory. My recollection is there is one Fisheries Biologist III, several Fisheries Biologists II, several Fisheries Biologists I, and considerable seasonal aid.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, how many? How many biologists in total? Perhaps Mr. Anderson can answer that. Aren't you the gentleman that more or less compiles the budget for the fiscal year?

MR. ANDERSON: I am sorry, I didn't appreciate we were going into our proposed 1960-61 budget. Therefore I didn't bring the budget material in detail.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We are going into it here. Can't you remember how many biologists in total at least generally?

MR. ANDERSON: I would say there would be seven or eight in total.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And the other would be in the category of seasonal help?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, that is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: As I understand this, you have a budget now in which you are going to put up \$70,000 to bring in these warm

water fishes, is that right?

MR. SHANNON: Not to bring in warm water fishes, Mr. Pattee, but to develop our existing reservoirs and those that are being built. In other words, there is a real potential here in developing these reservoirs to produce more fish.

If we take all the water acreage in California, if we can increase the production of fish ten pounds on each acre, we provide a great deal more fishing for the angler and this program is set up to find out the answers to do that.

MR. PATTEE: How much have you in the budget to do this, approximately \$70,000?

MR. SHANNON: Approximately \$70,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Are you going to hire eight people?

MR. SHANNON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Will that go over the \$70,000?

MR. ANDERSON: The figure is actually \$81,000.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any additional questions by members of the committee? All right, you proceed.

MR. SHANNON: In relation to your question concerning the use of general funds for fish and game purposes, as the problems of wildlife conservation have become more complicated, particularly since 1945 with the impact of increasing population, the Legislature has placed increasing responsibilities upon the Department, such as pollution control, water projects, conservation education and others. We believe expending fish and game preservation funds for such purposes is appropriate and justifiable.

The protection, maintenance and enhancement of California wildlife is putting an ever-increasing load on our limited revenues and it is difficult to stretch our dollars far enough to cover all the problems adequately.

Additional funds would be desirable; however, we recognize the present demand on the general fund and it appears doubtful if such funds will be available.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask you a question there? Have you made any effort at all in suggesting to the Department of Finance that general fund monies might be appropriated for some of the staff personnel that I understand you are interested in achieving for the purpose of water projects?

MR. SHANNON: We have not only this year, but we have brought this up in previous years, and the Department of Finance generally has been the guardian of the general fund and they have generally felt that we should stay within our existing revenue rather than try to call on the general fund.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Did you approach this subject matter to them this year as far as the staff that you are requesting for water projects?

MR. SHANNON: I don't think we have explored it specifically as to the water project positions. Our position in this thing is that according to law and so forth and our responsibility, the expenditure of fish and game money for water project work is justified. We have a job to do. The workload is increasing. We can't take care of the number of water projects that are now in

development and under planning. We have to have more people to handle this to provide sufficient releases for wildlife, to devise screens and ladders and all these other things that go with it.

We feel that we have to request this. If somebody else feels that it should come out of the general fund money and wishes to provide general fund money, of course, we would use such funds, but under the present situation where we have no assurance that general fund money will be there, we have to make provision to handle this workload and in the long run the conservation of the resource.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How many staff people are you asking for this fiscal budget for water project work in addition to what you already have?

MR. SHANNON: Can I go ahead on conservation education and then we can come back and answer your question?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think Mr. Anderson has it right there.

MR. ANDERSON: This is our request.

MR. SHANNON: We are requesting twenty-two positions. Now, this is not only for water projects, but also pollution control positions.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: They will be working specifically in the field of water?

MR. SHANNON: In the field of water on water projects and pollution control.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: How much was that, twenty-two?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Twenty-two positions. What is the total as

far as finances are concerned?

MR. SHANNON: \$259,000 plus some.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How many people do you now have that now work on water projects in various categories?

MR. FRASER: Mrs. Davis, I can perhaps answer that. In headquarters office we have working on water projects three positions and one clerical position. We also in headquarters have one position working on pollution. So you might say on water projects we have three in headquarters. We have six positions in the regions specifically working on water projects, and three positions specifically tied to the technical work of investigating pollution problems.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you feel, Mr. Shannon, that this staff has been adequate to serve the interests of Fish and Game in all these years or at least the time that you have had them for conservation of fish and game relative to the operation of irrigation districts and other water development that has taken place in the State?

MR. SHANNON: No, I don't believe this staff is adequate. In fact, I know it isn't because we are faced continually with having to produce reports and information and data and we have no one to do it, and that is why we are asking for these additional positions.

As you know, water development has increased in California tremendously in the last few years. Now, what has happened is that we have had to shunt people from other work, from fisheries manage-

ment work and other endeavors into this in order to try to take care of the workload. As a result, our other management programs have fallen by the wayside. They haven't been able to devote time to what they were specifically hired to do.

In conservation education Appendix B is a copy of the Department's conservation education printing budget schedule which you requested. Total amount budgeted for 1959-60 was \$112,791. Income from sales of various items as reported by the Documents Section of the Printing Division, Department of Finance, is summarized in Appendix C.

Generally speaking, we look on the printed material and the publications of the Department as essential tools designed to help Department employees do their jobs more effectively and an essential service by which Californians can keep informed of the activities, programs and status of their Department of Fish and Game.

The Department has avoided entering printing and publication fields in competition with private enterprise and has not promoted sale of any publications for the purpose of increasing revenue. The sales procedures which have been established through the Documents Section are designed primarily to expedite availability of bulk quantities which school districts, individuals or others are able and willing to purchase.

Sales for the six-month period from January 1, 1959, to June 30, 1959, totaled \$1,433.07. These are the latest figures available from the Documents Section.

One basic purpose of all Department publications is to make information available to all the people of California concerning the wildlife resources which they own. We believe such information should be made readily available without charge and that imposing a compulsory revenue producing requirement on Department printed materials would in effect create a form of economic censorship for most citizens in relation to knowledge concerning California wildlife resources.

Technical publications have the additional purpose of making available to technicians throughout the world our latest knowledge, in exchange for which we receive copies of their publications, incorporating new knowledge and information which often shortcuts and advances our research and management programs materially.

In reference to our budget for motion pictures, the costs of departmental motion picture production are included in the conservation education section of the budget under "Equipment", in accordance with Department of Finance procedure.

It is estimated the departmental pictures are viewed by more than one million adults and children annually.

Costs of pictures, produced on competitive bid by private producers during the past three years are as set forth in this schedule and I won't restate that here, but it amounts to six pictures which cost us \$27,895.

In relation to federal aid the breakdown by individual project of the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson "operating expenses" is attached as Appendix D of this report.

The Pittman-Robertson operating expenses totaled \$531,701.

The Dingell-Johnson operating expenses totaled \$105,560.

This completes my presentation and the committee has the appendices here which they may refer to if they would like more detailed information, and if we can answer questions, we will be happy to do so.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I am sure that as we proceed, as the different sportsmen's organizations testify before the committee there will be questions and we will be back to ask them of you which will specifically pinpoint some of the comments that are enclosed in your pamphlet.

At this time I would like to ask our next witness, Mr. Ray Welsh, who is the president of the Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire to come forward and make his wishes known.

(Thereupon Mr. Welsh was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Please be seated and proceed with your presentation.

MR. WELSH: Madame Chairman, do you guarantee me safety here at this table? You see I have caught something and I am not sure whether my license stamps and tags entitle me to what I have caught here in Sacramento. I will do my best.

Madame Chairman and members of the committee and ladies and gentlemen, my name is Ray E. Welsh, and I am here today representing the Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire.

The Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire is composed of

sportsmen's clubs and conservation groups of Marin, Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino Counties and represents more than 4,000 members of these organizations.

We are grateful for this opportunity to appear before your committee because the administration of fish and game resources of our area is of vital importance to us in many ways. We range from the metropolitan area in the south in Marin to the great public forest in the north in Mendocino, and in between we embrace fisheries of every description including a major portion of the State's salmon and steelhead area plus game habitat for virtually every species known in this State.

These are resources which furnish a recreational outlet to areas far beyond our four counties and which are of major economic importance to us. Therefore, your subject today is of extreme interest to the Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire. We find ourselves somewhat in a quandary, however, because we are dealing with a highly technical subject when we deal with the formation of a budget in terms of specific expenditures in specific amounts.

We are not and do not profess to be fiscal specialists, we are not agency administrators and we are not fish and game managers. We are, however, representative of a major segment of the public that is concerned that fish and game and the other natural resources of California not be overlooked when the problems fostered by a growing population are considered. We are able to state in broad terms some of the steps we feel must be taken if these resources

are to be properly managed in the future. And although we are laymen in one sense, we feel that we are able to speak with some authority because we represent that segment of the hunting and angling public which has banded together in rod and gun clubs to work actively for the preservation of these resources.

We feel, for example, that accelerated work is essential to the maintenance and enhancement of our anadromous fisheries. We feel that programs must be developed to insure the place of fish, game and recreation in the State's water development program.

We feel that there must be an increased emphasis on range management, brush burning and deer habitat development. We feel that pollution of the public waters must be controlled and eliminated.

There are hundreds of other items too, which our people are certain must be taken care of if the great pressures now upon these resources are to be resisted. Former Department of Fish and Game Director Warne recently presented a five-year wildlife conservation plan to Governor Brown which he said was designed to, and I quote, "meet the growing needs of our growing State." And who can quarrel with the nineteen major subjects which he said the Department plans to tackle in the next five years? They include all of the things we have talked about here and more.

These and more are all services the sportsmen of the State want. We can only presume that the sportsmen are willing to pay for them.

Your committee has told us, and again I quote, that "Now

is the time when a decision must be made by you (the sportsmen) as to whether there will be increased revenues to the Department or decreased services to the sportsmen."

On the other hand the Department has stated that "No increase in fishing and hunting license fees or tax is necessary or contemplated in the foreseeable future and our long-range plans are keyed to maintaining a reasonable balance between income and outgo without increased fees."

Because, as I stated earlier, we are not fiscal experts, we are somewhat perplexed by these opposing statements of fact and therefore cannot presume to judge their credulity or to state a positive opinion on the financial affairs of fish and game in California.

We might well quarrel with certain aspects of the raised trout program and wish for increased emphasis on habitat improvement and other activities aimed at increasing the natural inland trout fishery.

We might also quarrel with the pheasant program as a poor and costly substitute for natural propagation. We might feel that recreational activities of the Department as opposed to true resource preservation should be so labeled and paid for by those who use them.

But to do so again here would be "nit-picking" on our part because this subject has been hashed out so many times in the field, at the Rod and Gun Club and in these very halls, that we would only be repetitious.

Let me conclude then by saying that in the opinion of the Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire, the sportsmen of the State of California want that level of service from the Department of Fish and Game which is required to meet the challenge of the times. We recognize that to provide that service there will be administrative and other costs which do not directly put a bird in the field or have a fish in the stream, but if they, plus the direct costs, will insure that this important part of our national heritage will not be lost, we are willing to bear them.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: I don't have a question, but the testimony that is going to be given today, do we get a copy of the testimony? Are they making these available?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You will receive a copy of the transcript after it is available.

MR. WELSH: My copy is available for you.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Could you sum up that statement very briefly in your own words?

MR. WELSH: You mean you want me to read it again, Mr. Thomas?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: No. I don't want you to read it. I may be able to help you a little. You are dissatisfied with the Department's management?

MR. WELSH: If my article said that, I am, sir, but I don't quite phrase it in that term. Maybe that is what it says.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: In other words, you feel that sports-

men are not getting enough out of the Department for the money you are putting into it? Am I misstating your statement?

MR. WELSH: Shall we say that, Mr. Thomas, we feel that there is room for improvement without dealing in specifics. I might say that to you that in representing the entire council area and the clubs that it is very hard to deal in specifics because what would be a yes answer from one corner of the section would be a qualified no from the other corner, and within our own organizations there are individual clubs and people who will testify later before you and deal with specifics.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I see. In other words, you are not giving us specific recommendations in this statement?

MR. WELSH: This is representative of twenty-one clubs, in four counties.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Will we get specific recommendations from the sportsmen?

MR. WELSH: You will.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Any from your organization?

MR. WELSH: You will.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Later?

MR. WELSH: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN DAVISL: Well, Mr. Welsh, did your Council take any position at all - I assume you were divided on the now present policy statements that are presented to the Fish and Game Commission on both the artificial trout program and also the pheasant program?

MR. WELSH: I think, Madame Chairman, we adopted a concrete policy statement that our Council is in accord with yesterday morning on both subjects. Both of them I might say deal with a pay-as-you-go basis definitely. Does that answer your question?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That answers my question. Any other questions by members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Only one which is more of an observation. In other words, just because the term "contented cows" was coined by the dairies, you sportsmen want to do a little better, isn't that right?

MR. WELSH: Isn't there always room for improvement, Mr. Allen? We have ideas of grandeur which we never will reach, but isn't there always room for improvement, making the dollar reach farther and putting an extra fish in the stream for someone to catch?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: There are always ideas. I have noticed in the conservation magazine where they began to clean up the streams and that was discussed up in Humboldt County at one of our meetings up there about debris removal and so forth and so on. Now, I begin to see it is actually taking place.

MR. WELSH: Yes, sir, we have spent almost a year in the area in which I live and we have as of at the moment almost completely cleaned up the watershed of two whole streams.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: That is some of the examples of things that you point up?

MR. WELSH: Correct, anadromous fish work that is a

necessity.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Welsh, I have one additional question. Did your Council go into any discussion as to the proposed budget for the next fiscal year as far as expanding of the program and the staff involved? If so, are you in accord or do you have some differences of opinion as far as the costs of operation of the Department for the future are concerned?

MR. WELSH: As the President of the Council, Madame Chairman, I can't answer that question for this reason. We did not get these figures and the positions requested and whatnot until after our Council meeting a week ago Sunday so we have not had a chance as a unit to discuss them. I received them since I came to Sacramento.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Then, would it be possible for you to submit to this committee the decision of your Council relative to that point at a very early date?

MR. WELSH: Yes, ma'am, I think we are scheduled to meet the sixth of March. Would that be too late?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Sixth of March, no, that would be fine. Now, let me ask you one further question. The financial report that was given to you which I hope you understand contained the departmental figures, as far as those figures in the report other than the fees and the artificially raised trout programs that were incorporated in the report of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report because that was the only place that we could achieve them, were your people and your particular Council happy with the status quo of the expenditure in all phases of the Department?

MR. WELSH: No, ma'am. I cannot say that we were. I can say that the opinions were widely varied and divided and as I said a moment ago there will be certain specific groups within our organization who will discuss certain specific phases and economics of this budget, but as a complete unit it was impossible to come up with a set of qualified answers for you on this.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much. Any other questions? If not, thank you very much, Mr. Welsh. Now, our next witness will be Eddie Bruce, who is the President of the California Wildlife Federation.

(Thereupon Mr. Bruce was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Be seated please. Now, as I understand it, you are the President of the California Wildlife Federation and will you explain briefly how many councils belong to your organization so that the membership of this committee can have that background before you proceed with the testimony?

MR. BRUCE: Yes, Madame Chairman, there are nine member councils and there are in excess of 100,000 active memberships.

Madame Chairman and members of the Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game and guests, my name is Edward F. Bruce and I am here today representing the California Wildlife Federation, which is composed of nine member councils with a membership in excess of 100,000 which covers almost the length and breadth of this State.

We are indeed grateful of this opportunity to appear before

your committee because the administration of the fish and game resources are of major importance to us.

With respect to each of the three questions contained in your letter of December 7, 1959, my answer is a "yes" qualified of necessity by the diversity of circumstances and conditions faced by member councils over our great State of California.

No doubt at the conclusion of the testimony to be submitted by representatives of our councils, you will note that some areas feel the need of expansion in certain fields while others find such expansions unnecessary. The same applies to cutbacks in other areas.

Because of this circumstance, I very respectfully request the privilege of summarizing on behalf of the California Wildlife Federation at the conclusion of the testimony of our member councils.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You will have that privilege, Mr. Bruce, being the President of the California Wildlife Federation.

MR. BRUCE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Among your councils how widespread have you - how much access have you had to this Booz, Allen and Hamilton report?

MR. BRUCE: How much access have we had?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Have you had sufficient copies?

MR. BRUCE: Yes, we have. We have a reasonable amount of them.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: They have been readily available to you?

MR. BRUCE: Yes, they have.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: The reason I ask is that one of your chapters, I have had requests from time to time and I have exhausted my supply and I just wondered if you folks are taking most of your deliberations after reading this report?

MR. BRUCE: We have had a vast amount of these, but they were not vast enough to give to each and every individual of an immediate club a copy. The councils have had them.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask a question? Have they taken any action on the report, whether it is a good report? What did they say about it?

MR. BRUCE: Well, Mr. Thomas, in answer to that, it is a very difficult thing for us as sportsmen to put ourselves in the position of trying to arrive at a cost basis of whether the cost of the program for the Department of Fish and Game was good or bad. As I said before in my statement, we encompass almost the entire State of California and the opinions are diversified so much that you cannot actually come to a concrete understanding.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: There are some 200 recommendations in this report. I was just wondering whether or not your Council could agree with any one of them?

MR. BRUCE: Well, as the--

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: We have a report that is very costly. I don't know why we have these reports and surveys because by the time we try to put them into effect they become obsolete, some of

them. I don't mean all of them, but there are 200 various recommendations that are made. I don't know whether the committee is going to take cognizance of any of these or what we are going to do about them, but has your Council done anything about these recommendations?

MR. BRUCE: We have them in our possession, yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: You have taken no action?

MR. BRUCE: We have taken no action on them, no.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Bruce, has the California Wildlife Federation taken any position one way or the other on the recommendation of the Department to the Commission, first on the trout program and second on the pheasant program?

MR. BRUCE: We have, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: What are your recommendations as far as the California Wildlife Federation on the trout program is concerned?

MR. BRUCE: This is the resolution which was just adopted yesterday, Madame Chairman.

"Resolved by the California Wildlife Federation that we hereby support the proposed California Fish and Game Commission policy on the trout hatchery program (which replaces the ceiling policy adopted in 1956).

"Thereby the ceiling of the annual (fiscal year) cost of the trout hatchery program for catchable trout and subcatchable trout, but not including fingerling trout, shall not exceed the income from the trout stamp sales to trout anglers during the

prior budget period."

Do you desire to have the pheasant resolution read?

~~CHAIRMAN~~ CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes.

MR. BRUCE: "Resolved by the California Wildlife Federation that we hereby support the retention and maintenance of past lawful 'put-and-take' adult pheasant planting in Zone B pheasant area, with such total not to exceed the revenue of pheasant license money collected in the prior budget period;

"That the State Game Farm production of 'put-and-take' adult pheasants shall be reduced to the above needed output;

"That pheasant management in Zone A pheasant area shall include habitat improvement."

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In other words, you are differing there. The California Wildlife Federation is not completely in accord with what the Department has recommended to the Commission?

MR. BRUCE: This is correct.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you more clearly emphasize the areas where you have a difference of opinion?

MR. BRUCE: Madame Chairman, if I may, with your permission put this question off so you may ask the same question of the member councils as they submit testimony, I am sure it would be much better put to you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Very fine. Any other members of the committee have any questions? Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: I just wanted to clear up the one point. You state this ceiling of the revenues should limit only

the catchable and the subcatchable, but the fingerling program should not necessarily be limited or included?

MR. BRUCE: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: In other words, you are looking to other sources of revenue to carry on the fingerling program?

MR. BRUCE: This is basically the idea, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Lunardi.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: Mr. Bruce, do you have any direct recommendations at this time on how you will raise the revenues for the program?

MR. BRUCE: Mr. Lunardi, the Legislature applied \$100,000 for this. I still don't think they have the answer to that. Although the sportsmen of the State are vastly interested in this, we do not as yet have a specific recommendation, but we hope to and we hope to submit the same type of situation before this committee for your approval in the near future.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: I gather from what you say in the resolutions that have been submitted by your organization that aside from the fingerling program that they should not exceed the revenues?

MR. BRUCE: That is right.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Then, my last question. Mr. Bruce, how soon do you feel that the California Wildlife Federation can submit a recommendation to this committee pertaining to what revenue is going to be forthcoming for the fingerling program?

MR. BRUCE: Madame Chairman, this item will be placed on

the agenda for the consideration of the directors of the Federation at our next meeting to be held in Bakersfield in April. Now, this is the established date of our meeting. It will be approximately the last week of April.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Then, will you make sure that you submit that recommendation to this committee for its information?

MR. BRUCE: If the Federation takes action on this, this committee will have the recommendation, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, I am assuming it is very important that you do so.

MR. BRUCE: I assume so, too.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by the members of the committee? Senator, do you have any questions?

SENATOR ERHART: No.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Bruce. I am hopeful that you will remain here for the rest of the afternoon and tomorrow in case we do have some questions.

MR. BRUCE: Madame Chairman, I have made arrangements for just such a provision. Thank you very kindly.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Is Dave Keller in the audience?

(Thereupon Mr. Keller was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Please be seated and proceed.

MR. KELLER: Mrs. Davis and members of the committee, I don't have a formal statement to make, but Mrs. Davis did ask me to get together some information on the fund condition of the

Department of Fish and Game.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: This is Mr. Dave Keller from the Legislative Analyst's office.

MR. KELLER: I am sorry. Particularly with respect to the so-called frozen portion. As you recall the bill which increased the various fees included a section which said that 50% of the increase would be kept in a separate account as it were and would not be subject to expenditure except by specific appropriation of the Legislature.

Of course, each time that a budget is proposed and it contains any part of this frozen portion and the Legislature passes it, this constitutes an approval of the appropriation of the frozen portion.

Now, the budget that is being proposed for 1960-61 will come within a half million dollars of expending the total revenue for the year and this is without including any capital outlay. I have no specific figures on capital outlay as yet, but I understand some will be forthcoming.

Among the things as I recall that have been talked about, for example, are the construction of the new patrol vessel for the north coast. There is only one that is doing the job now and it isn't sufficient. This would mean that if any capital outlay is included that the revenue for the 1960-61 fiscal year will be expended almost in its entirety.

Now, from the time that the Act became effective up to and including the proposed budget year, the so-called frozen portion

should have totaled according to my calculations somewhere in the vicinity of six and a half million dollars, so that the total surplus at the end of the budget year of 1960-61 should have been something in the vicinity of seven million dollars.

Actually this surplus will only be about five million dollars which means in effect that through that budget year you will have expended two million dollars out of this supposed frozen portion. Now, at the rate that the revenues have been increasing contrasted with the rate at which salaries have been going up, with the annual increases, the normal permit salary adjustments for the salary ranges, increases in costs of all the services that the Department obtains, if in the following year, that is 1961-62, there is no increase in level of service, no new programs, no additional positions, and if the revenue increases no more than has been projected in the past, that particular year may well be a point at which you have reached a saturation. That is, you will be expending every nickel the Department takes in.

If you, on the other hand, add anything to services in any way, you are going to start to dip into the surplus and you will be operating in essence on a deficit basis. You will be spending more than you take in.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: So actually, what you are saying, Mr. Keller, is that for the year of 1960-61, if we should grant the expanded program even to some degree, that the Department is requesting, they will use proportionately the majority of the

frozen funds that are intact now?

MR. KELLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And then realistically you would have to assume that the Department in the year of 1961-62 would not be before the Legislature asking for one single additional staff or any increase anywhere in order to continue on their basic level and keep within their revenue basis, is that you are saying?

MR. KELLER: Yes, essentially if they are to stay within their revenues, they would have to come before you in 1961-62 with essentially the same level of service they are asking for now.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well now, have you found in your experience around these legislative halls that any state agency customarily remains status quo and never comes to the Legislature without any specific requests for a single solitary thing? Is that realistic to assume?

MR. KELLER: There have been examples. There have been some agencies that have remained static. Oddly enough there have been a few that have been cut back. Actually, the program which is - I think the Department of Fish and Game hasn't expanded a great deal. I think a good part of their increased expenditure has been purely salary adjustments, just increased costs of doing business. This is one of the unfortunate parts of a fixed form of income in which you have a fixed fee irrespective of what it costs to provide a service.

In the case of almost all of the other state services, its

income is more or less based on the total economic level of the State. You have in a sense a percentage of the total income of the citizens of the State in the form of the sales tax and so on.

In the case of an agency like this where you have a fixed fee and you cannot anticipate that a great many more people are going to make use of these facilities each year, they are caught in a kind of nutcracker.

On the one hand the salaries keep getting pushed up each year. As you know, nearly every year for the past, as long as I have been here, there has been a salary increase fund. Certainly prices for everything, goods, services, supplies, everything that they buy, have been going up and with all due respect to the agency some of their trouble is not their own fault.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well this we recognize, but then you are not saying, or are you, that their program they are recommending this year with 75 new people in their Department is a hundred per cent justified?

MR. KELLER: No, ma'am, I am not saying it is either justifiable or unjustifiable at this time. I am just trying to establish some street signs as it were.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think we can all recognize that if we should give the Department the staff that they are requesting in total of 22 people for water projects, this would be I would assume just the mere beginning because anytime you embark upon the staff that is needed for the investigation in water projects, certainly that is going to be a continuing thing. Am I not correct

in my assumption?

MR. KELLER: This is probably true, but it can still be controlled by the Legislature. They can be allowed to expand or not as the Legislature sees fit.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I understand that. So actually unless they keep the status quo for the year 1961-62, there is a probability that the sportsmen would be faced with a probable increase in license, all of it depending upon what their programs would consist of at that time?

MR. KELLER: That is right, unless you wanted to begin to use up the surplus.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by the members?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Has your office taken any action on the proposed budget by the Department?

MR. KELLER: Not yet.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, do you anticipate that, do you know?

MR. KELLER: Well, we are in kind of a bind right now. Mr. Post is on his back with the flu and--

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: You don't know officially just what the position will be?

MR. KELLER: I don't know. We were going to discuss it this week. Now, I can't tell you when we will discuss it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: And this surplus that you talked about, was that six million dollars?

MR. KELLER: It is about five million dollars or will be

five million at the end of the budget year.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: So the money is there? The money will be available?

MR. KELLER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: So actually the Department wouldn't have to be operating in the red?

MR. KELLER: No, they will not be operating in the red, assuming the revenues come in as anticipated.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: For 1962 we can still say we have some money there?

MR. KELLER: That is perfectly true.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: So the Department is financially in a good position?

MR. KELLER: Well, they are not broke if that is what you mean.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: No, that is right. In 1962 they would still have money?

MR. KELLER: They will still have a surplus but that surplus will amount to just a fraction of their annual cost of operation, less than half.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I know that, but you were also anticipating the income. Are you taking into consideration the income of 1962?

MR. KELLER: Yes, we are. What I said was based on the income coming in on pretty much the same level of annual increase that we have had. There are a certain number of new hunters and

fishermen every year.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: What I am trying to get at, you are not going to use the five million dollars in 1962?

MR. KELLER: No, of course not.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: That is the point, you will still have something available?

MR. KELLER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: So coming to a conclusion, a logical conclusion, the Department financially is in a pretty good position?

MR. KELLER: The Department is in a good position from the standpoint of having this surplus.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Yes.

MR. KELLER: But the point I was trying to make is that if there is any substantial expansion in the programs of the Department in 1961-62, they will begin to be spending more than they will be taking in and this is simply not a good policy on the face of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: What is the five million dollars doing there? What are we going to do with it?

MR. KELLER: Generally speaking, since this is a special fund, the five million dollars or at least a substantial part of it ought to be preserved as a cushion. There may be situations of emergency that might arise. There might be unexpected drops in the revenue, and a drop in the revenue is not going to drop a program or curtail positions. They will be there just the same and they will have to be supported and I think from a financial

standpoint it is wise to keep a certain amount of cushion there.

Now, I am not going to argue that five million is the figure. Maybe three million is the figure.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: That is what I was coming to.

MR. KELLER: But the point I wanted to make is that this is the time at which you would have to start to think of which way you are going. Are we going to start to use up some of the surplus or are we going to start to think in terms of another round of fee increases?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee? Mr. Keller, can you submit to this committee a breakdown of the frozen fund monies that you have quoted here today in addition to what my secretary is able to take down so we have it for the record.

MR. KELLER: I don't have it in good enough condition right now to give to you but I will have it for you tomorrow. Will that be all right?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That will be fine. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask Mr. Shannon a question? Mr. Shannon, you are Director of the Department. What is your opinion on the financial status of the Department? Does it look black? I mean what does the future look like?

MR. SHANNON: I think the financial position at the present is sound. I don't disagree too much with what Mr. Keller stated. We have been operating you might say very economically and with rather severe restrictions over the past few years because of the

lack of funds. Then we got the license increase. Now a certain amount of money has developed. We have money for increased operating expenses and some for capital outlay.

We think in view of the need to protect and maintain California's resources, this is the time to step forward and use some of the money that we have gotten from the increased license fees. We don't propose to operate in the red.

For a special fund agency to operate in the red is bad business, I believe. We have as far as the surplus is concerned five million dollars or whatever it may be, four million and a half, or whatever it is, and that is sufficient cushion to provide for any emergency.

In fact, my own personal thought is that it is almost twice as much as is really needed for a cushion and I don't say that we should use all that up, but for certain one-time, one-shot capital expenditures, we can draw on that surplus occasionally. Does that answer your question, Mr. Thomas?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Yes, in other words the Department is financially stable right now for the next three or four years we can say?

MR. SHANNON: I think we are in pretty good position and if in 1961-62 it appears that by increasing our services considerably we would be in the red, if I am Director at that time, I wouldn't do it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: And even though you are making application for 75 new positions, you still feel that that financial

situation is good?

MR. SHANNON: It is still sound in view of the added positions.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Burke.

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: I was wondering when you appear before the Ways and Means Committee with your budget, do they take into consideration the cushion? Do they know about it? I know it is the policy of the committee to cut back your appropriation if possible and so forth. Do they know about this continuing surplus?

MR. SHANNON: I am sure they would. However, if they don't, we would be glad to present figures, the exact figures to them.

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: All right.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions? Senator, do you have a question?

SENATOR ERHART: Not now.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Our next witness is going to be Miss Blanche Kral. Will you come forward please. Miss Kral will be representing the Inland Council of Conservation Clubs.

(Thereupon Miss Kral was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Be seated and proceed.

MISS KRAL: I am Blanche Kral and appointed Director from the Inland Council of Conservation Clubs, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, to the California Wildlife Federation and the statement I am about to give is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and to the wishes of those I represent.

The majority of the items of the Department of Fish and Game expenditures are controversial, primarily due to the more than eleven hundred miles distance between the southern and northern boundaries of our State and the vast differences in resources.

Basically the Department of Fish and Game has done a good job, but with the ever-increasing population growth and the demands there will be increases and decreases not only in resources but in revenues and expenditures as well.

With the number of subunits in the Department more personnel is needed in one unit than in another. Thus additional positions allotted for will be helpful and demanding in the future but at the present it is felt by a majority of those I represent that there should be no increase in license fees and no decrease in services from our Department. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee? Well, I have one. What is the position of the Inland Council of Conservation Clubs on the trout program?

MISS KRAL: We feel that we want the trout program down there for the simple reason we have no wild trout and most of ours are planted. As a matter of fact, all of them are planted.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: So then you agree with the recommendation that the Department has made to the Fish and Game Commission for possible adoption?

MISS KRAL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, what is the Inland Council's position

on the pheasant program?

MISS KRAL: I am only speaking this for myself and representing the Inland Council, I also feel the same way about it due to the fact that we have no pheasant habitat, natural pheasant habitat down in the southern portion, which I represent, San Bernardino County especially. We don't have any wildlife, any wild pheasants whatsoever, so we are very much in favor of the pheasant policy and the put-and-take program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: As it exists now or the recommendation that is being made to the Commission?

MISS KRAL: As it exists. Actually, to tell you the truth, I do not know much about this that is in existence now. I did not have the pheasant policy with me to study, but we are in favor of the pheasant policy, the put-and-take program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: As it exists now, as I understand, this is your position?

MISS KRAL: I do not have the existing policy now. I don't know what it is.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, before she states this for the record, would you please bring her up to date as to the present pheasant policy so that we can go into this factually?

MR. SHANNON: Well, the present pheasant policy provides for throughout the State the raising of approximately 50,000 adult birds and a certain number of small birds. The 50,000 birds are planted on public lands in cooperative areas. The chicks that are raised are supplied to sportsmen's organizations

so that they can raise them. I think Miss Kral is in favor - I am not trying to read words into her meaning, but I think she is probably in favor of continuing the artificial stocking of pheasants in the south and the continuation of those two cooperative hunting areas in southern California and that ties into the present pheasant policy.

MISS KRAL: What is the Department's proposed policy? I would like to know.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, Mr. Shannon, you have heard the question.

MR. SHANNON: The proposed policy is that we discontinue all of our game farms except two. One would be at Yountville and one would be at Chino. We would discontinue the planting of birds for put-and-take shooting. We would raise approximately 2,000 immature birds for distribution to sportsmen's organizations where they now have pens and would like to raise pheasants on their own and pay for them and plant them. We would continue that program, but we would discontinue put-and-take shooting for the gun clubs.

MISS KRAL: Thank you, Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: This I might say would be done gradually over a period of about three years and then certain game farms would be discontinued.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you have any comment on that?

MISS KRAL: The only comment I have to make is I personally would like to see the present policy continued.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Yes. Miss Kral, you are familiar with the Mojave plant that the Fish and Game have, that is the hatchery on the Mojave River?

MISS KRAL: I know about it, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Are you familiar with the one that is conducted by private industry over there?

MISS KRAL: No, I am not.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Okeh. Thank you.

SENATOR ERHART: Miss Kral, you made one statement that your group wanted the present services maintained on the present level and also the fees maintained on the present level?

MISS KRAL: Yes, sir.

SENATOR ERHART: Now, if the costs of operations, salaries and maintenance and so forth go up, how can they maintain the present level of service without increasing the cost or coming down on the services they give?

MISS KRAL: Well, according to the way I understood this, it is that we do have enough in the Department where our services can continue the same without raising our license fees.

SENATOR ERHART: You mean to use up the surplus?

MISS KRAL: Beg your pardon?

SENATOR ERHART: You mean to dip into the surplus?

MISS KRAL: The only thing I can say is if I had this report and would have studied it further, then I could have given you a better answer, but it seems as though that this report did not reach my hands and I couldn't get ahold of enough of our personnel

in order to thoroughly discuss it and really none of us knew much about it.

SENATOR ERHART: It seems to me that if your income were to remain a certain number of dollars and the cost of your services would go up and you would have to live within that number of dollars, you would have to cut the services or else increase the fees?

MISS KRAL: You have so many dollars and so many services and you have got so much in the bank, you can go ahead and level it off.

SENATOR ERHART: I wanted you to say that then you would have to use some of the monies that we now have in this fund.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, let me ask you if the Commission should go along with your recommendation on the elimination of, what is it, six game farms?

MR. SHANNON: Approximately.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And retaining the one at Chino and the one at Yountville and as I understand the one at Yountville is one where you would primarily raise the baby chicks?

MR. SHANNON: Both of them - at both of them we would raise chicks for the sportsmen.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And how many? Do you have any amount in mind?

MR. SHANNON: Of chicks?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes.

MR. SHANNON: Well, in the neighborhood of 20,000.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: What is going to happen to the pheasant tags that we have had all this time? I mean the pheasant program and the revenue that they bring in?

MR. SHANNON: Well, that is up to the Legislature, of course, because that is set by the Legislature. There is a license fee in effect to hunt pheasants and as to what would happen to that would be up to the discretion of the Legislature.

As a little back history on that, the pheasant tag was not specifically tied to the game farm program. At the time that the pheasant tag was inaugurated a system of cooperative hunting areas was in the picture and the feeling, and I can't say by all the legislators certainly and I don't mean to try to interpret intent, but by some of the legislators, they felt that this money could be obtained through the sale of pheasant tags and it would help finance the cooperative hunting program which has been in existence for a number of years and came on about the same time as the pheasant tag.

The pheasant tag was not designed to finance specifically and restricted only to the game farm program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: What was your revenue from the pheasant tags this present season? Do you have any idea?

MR. SHANNON: It was approximately \$400,000. We have in the neighborhood of 200,000 pheasant hunters.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Then, as far as this year is concerned were you planning on absorbing that \$400,000 in some other programs since it wasn't specifically earmarked for the pheasant program?

MR. SHANNON: Well, the \$400,000 is not earmarked specifically for the cooperative hunting program. It is used to finance that and other game programs and partially, too, the game farms.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: So what you are saying is that money would be disbursed to other programs?

MR. SHANNON: Well, it is disbursed to other programs now and if we did away with the game farms, of course, it would cost so much to run these two game farms and raise these 20,000 chicks, but then the money that came in in addition to that that was required for those purposes would be used to improve pheasant habitat and to provide more effective patrol perhaps in pheasant areas and so forth and perhaps some of it would, if there was more than that necessary for those purposes, it would go into other game programs, no doubt.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Will you discuss briefly just what you plan on doing with these baby chicks that you are going to raise at these two game farms? You are going to give them to whom?

MR. SHANNON: Well, at the present time we have quite a few groups that like to raise pheasants and release them and they have established pens and paid for them sometimes out of their own funds, sometimes out of the county fine monies and they have a program set up wherein they cooperate and obtain, feed and raise these birds from small ones up to maturity, and then they are released in accordance with regulations of the Fish and Game Commission. They have to be released on public lands, so we would in order not to throw these people out of business who

have their pheasant pens established and it is a hobby, and many times it is one of the things that keeps the club together - we would propose to furnish these clubs with all the small birds that they have to depend upon the State for as a rule, and we would continue to supply these so that they could continue their pheasant program.

We think possibly after a number of years they would come to the same conclusion we have and some of them already have in the past that raising mature birds for put-and-take shooting is a pretty expensive proposition.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, Mr. Shannon, are these private clubs going to be able to retain some of these baby chicks for reimbursement for raising these baby chicks to adulthood, or do they have to plant all of them on private lands?

MR. SHANNON: These are not private clubs as such. They are sportsmen's groups. In other words it is a sportsmen's group, anybody can join. Sometimes it is a large club and they raise these birds to maturity.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I know that, but you are going to let them retain some of these baby chicks for their own planting on their particular areas?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, the regulations provide that they would retain a certain number of these for planting and then they would have to plant a certain number in accordance with the direction of the Department of Fish and Game on public lands.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I at this time with the permission of

the committee ask Mr. Kent De Chambeau, who is the counsel for the committee, relative to discussing and making very clear the law as it relates to the pheasant program?

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: I believe you are referring to Section 1529 of the Fish and Game Code which provides the output of any State game farm shall be distributed on public lands where the Department determines that the output will receive adequate protection and be most likely to thrive and multiply. I believe this would apply to any birds that could be considered the output of a game farm. I believe that would include these small chicks, so therefore they would be required to be planted on public lands or wherever they would be most likely to thrive and multiply.

MR. SHANNON: That can be worked out. They have to be planted on public lands. That is one part, or they must be planted at a place where the Department thinks that they will thrive and multiply. So this latter part can often be done in consultation with the sportsmen's clubs which raise the birds and most often is. They want to know where we think would be the best place for these birds and in most cases that is where they are planted.

Then in addition many of them go on to public lands, which is the first part of that section that you read.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you feel, Mr. Shannon, that at all times these birds have been released according to this law, that they were released in areas natural to their habitat where

they can actually survive even by these clubs?

MR. SHANNON: I couldn't say honestly in all cases that this has been done. I would say this, that we have been guided by this in our planting of birds out of game farms, that we have tried to plant them on public lands and that is why we plant a lot of them on co-ops, our cooperative areas, where people can shoot them and take them.

In some cases there is a question in relation to private lands as to whether or not they have been planted in areas where they would thrive and multiply. That is open to question in some cases. I wouldn't say.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Just one more question if I may and that is that since you are decreasing your number of chicks that you are going to have an interest in, who is going to supply these co-op areas, these public co-op areas that you have supplied in the past, or is it just going to be a thing of the past, or are they going to become an interest of the county government or probably a sportsmen's organization or what is going to happen to these public shooting grounds?

MR. SHANNON: Well, in relation to our proposed policy, you are talking if our proposed policy goes through?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is correct.

MR. SHANNON: In relation to the proposed policy in southern California, the two co-ops would go out of existence unless the sportsmen wish to raise these birds and plant them on a co-op. I mean they might pick this up, raise their own birds and we would

furnish the chicks and they could conduct the co-op on their own down there and plant birds on public lands where people could shoot them.

In northern California, or rather Central California where we have the greatest number of co-ops, we would plan on continuing our co-ops, but the supply of birds would be dependent upon wild birds and not upon put-and-take shooting. Now, this may seem a little strange when you first think about it, but actually the number of planted birds that end up in the hunter's bag is relatively small, perhaps 10% or less, of all of the birds that end up in the hunter's bag, and I can say in some cases in certain areas that are never stocked with planted birds, they produce better hunting than those that are stocked with planted birds.

For instance, we can take our Gray Lodge Refuge up here which is one of our water fowl management areas that we open to pheasant hunting during each pheasant season. The take of pheasants on that area is probably as high or greater per hunter than any other co-op and yet we don't plant birds there for put-and-take shooting.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Burke, I believe you had a question?

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: How long before the season opens are these birds planted? Are they planted long enough ahead so they kind of get acquainted with the territory and so forth before the season opens?

MR. SHANNON: Many years ago we operated somewhat on that

principle and we found that we were pursuing the wrong tack. In other words we plant as close to the opening of the season as possible and right during the season. Through investigation we found that many more of the birds are taken that way than they are if they are planted ahead of the season.

Now, when they are planted a month or two months or three months ahead of the season one normally would think they would become adapted to their environment and do better. On the other hand, what happens to them is that many of them succumb to predators and you have much fewer birds available during the hunting season.

Rather than adapting themselves to the environment, they disappear. They die. They are not used to the surroundings they are put in or they are taken by predators. So in order to get the most birds in the hunters' bags we found the best procedure is to plant close to the opening of the season and sometimes right during the season.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee? I believe that will be all. Thank you very much, Blanche, and at this time we will give our court reporter a ten-minute recess.

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, I understand you have a point you want to clarify as far as definition of public land, so you may proceed at this time.

MR. SHANNON: In the previous testimony I said that we

planted birds on public lands in the cooperative hunting area. Actually these are private lands but they are open to access by the public through agreement with the Department and our understanding of the intent of the Legislature is that what they wanted is the bird planted in areas which would be accessible to the public and we have interpreted that to mean that if private lands are open to access by the public we would be within our proper sphere if we planted birds on such lands because they would be open to public access.

Now, in some cases we have other areas where we plant birds that are on lands which are under agreement not in the cooperative hunting areas but in other areas where the owners have agreed to open the lands and sometimes after we have planted the birds they have failed to open the land and in that case we haven't planted any more birds.

Our principal rule is to plant those birds where they are accessible to the public.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I at this time ask Mr. De Chambeau if that is his interpretation of the law?

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: No, our office opinion of public land is as it is defined in Ballantine's law dictionary, which says that it is that part of the public domain which is subject to sale or other disposition under general laws. So this would not include land which is not subject to sale or other disposition under general laws.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: Well, in this case I feel if we continue with the present pheasant program we should ask the Legislature for a change in the law so we wouldn't be violating technically you might say the law.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, we will take note of that.
Mr. Scheuermann, I understand you have some questions you wanted to ask Mr. Shannon.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: Getting back a minute to the new policy that is before the Commission now, the general plan is to cut back production from 50,000 to 20,000 and reduce--

MR. SHANNON: No, actually, Mr. Scheuermann, we raise about 50,000 mature birds and in addition we raise somewhat over 20,000 chicks.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: And you would get back to raising 20,000 chicks?

MR. SHANNON: Or chicks in such condition that the sportsmen's groups could raise them from there on out.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: And reducing the total number of game farms from eight to two?

MR. SHANNON: Down to two game farms, yes.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: The one being at Chino where you would use prison labor?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, we are in the process now of transferring our Chino game farm on to the Chino prison there and utilizing prison labor to run the game farm, and so we would have two game farms there eventually, one on Chino prison and the other at

Yountville.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: Now, you presently have 34 people employed permanently in game farms?

MR. SHANNON: Thirty-four? I can't say exactly.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: Well, according to the Commission minutes of October 9, page 19.

MR. SHANNON: I would assume so then. I am not sure of that figure.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: Now, if you are going to cut back production and if you are going to reduce the number of game farms, would it be logical to assume you are going to reduce personnel?

MR. SHANNON: There would be a reduction of personnel, yes, employed in the game farms. However, this does not mean that these people would be fired. Over a three year period we have enough attrition throughout the agency to pick these people up in their same rating and put them to work. There would be no increase in positions, but we would just transfer them to another duty.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: They would be transferred from pheasant work in the twelve items you outlined?

MR. SHANNON: They might or they might even be in deer work or some other phase of game or might even be in fisheries work if they wish to make a change in their classification.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well then, Mr. Shannon, if that is the case, then how many staff people would that actually entail?

MR. SHANNON: How much reduction in staff people?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes. I mean if you were to absorb them in other programs, how many people are you talking about?

MR. SHANNON: Well, there would be a reduction. You see, Mr. Davis, in these - the point I wanted to make was that supposing we have 34,000 and supposing - these figures may not make sense - I am just using that as an example. We have 34 employees now. Supposing it took ten people to run the two game farms, so there would be a reduction of 24 people. Then these people would not be fired but as positions opened by people quitting the agency or being transferred, promoted, there would be a vacant position here. Those people would be moved into that vacant position and it doesn't mean they would be fired, but still at the same time there would be a reduction, overall reduction of 24 positions.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I interrupt? I would like to introduce one of our new colleagues, Assemblyman Carroll. If you would like to join us we would be most happy to have you sit in.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARROLL: Thank you, but I have to catch a plane.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, what I am trying to say, then in view of this you would absorb these people in different categories even probably of their own choice, so would it be necessary then to be requesting 75 new people this legislative session for the next fiscal year, in view of the fact that you are making this recommendation to the Fish and Game Commission

as far as this particular pheasant program is concerned?

MR. SHANNON: Well, to begin with, this program would be accomplished over a three year period.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I realize that.

MR. SHANNON: And this would be distributed over three years. The addition to the program that we are requesting in the next fiscal year, 1960-61, is in reference to certain areas. Now, the reduction in the game farms is in a different area. We couldn't necessarily take these people in the game farm and put them into the areas that we are requesting an additional service for because in most cases they wouldn't be qualified. They are not - well, for instance, in pollution we need people trained in the techniques of pollution control, and in water projects we need people versed in water work and biology and hydraulics.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, that still makes me question this somewhat because where are you going to find a specific category that you can absorb these people into? This is what you have not answered satisfactorily to me.

MR. SHANNON: We have lots of them.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Lots of them where?

MR. SHANNON: Well, these people - well, in the game farms and as Fish and Game assistants. That is our lower class, and Game Manager I, and in some cases occasionally Game Manager II.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We have too many game managers now. That is my personal opinion.

MR. SHANNON: Well, we have throughout the agency vacancies

come up continually for Fish and Game Assistants, Game Managers I, so these people would just be transferred out of the game farm into another Game Manager I position or Fish and Game Assistant. We have a vacancy list each month of continuing vacancies of maybe 30 or 40 positions. Every agency does because of problems of recruitment and filling positions. Sometimes it is two or three weeks before you can fill a position because of getting the eligible list from the Personnel Board and so forth, so from the time that the man quits or is promoted and we fill the position sometimes it is a couple of weeks, sometimes a week, sometimes a day, so there is always a number of positions that aren't filled.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee?

We have next on the agenda the San Diego County Wildlife Federation, which is going to be represented by Mr. Richardson. Will you come forward, please?

(Thereupon Mr. Richardson was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Be seated and proceed.

MR. RICHARDSON: Madame Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Reg Richardson. I represent the San Diego County Wildlife Federation which is a council for 19 clubs in that area. They have very many diversified interests and needs. For this reason it is possible only to answer the committee's inquiries with a qualified yes. The part of the State I represent is greatly dependent on the artificial or so-called "put-and-take" programs. As to the question on needed expansion,

this "put-and-take" program will need to be increased with the public demand which is indicated by the increased licenses sold.

We know that that part of the State of California is probably growing faster than any other part. People are coming in by the droves. It is recognized that there should be some cutbacks in some of the Fish and Game fields within the State.

We in our area are certainly always looking for new activities that may become available to our hunters and fishermen and that is because we have so few natural ones so that for instance the introduction of this Florida Bass may be a terrific impetus to the particular area that we have. It will be a sort of thing that they are looking for and it takes a lot of work and of course it is costly, so this concludes my testimony as far as our area there and I will try to answer any questions of the committee.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Richardson, where do you want the cutbacks?

MR. RICHARDSON: Our group hasn't gone too much into the cutbacks. We naturally are part of the California Wildlife Federation and work together with the rest of the councils of the State. We do agree on some of them as to this "put-and-take" program in areas that have natural habitat. If the cutbacks have to be made, why naturally we go along with that where the money in turn can be used for increased natural habitat uses like stream improvement and things like that.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: So I understand you correctly, what you are saying is that you would be willing to share some of the revenue

from the trout stamp to be used for stream improvement and lake improvement?

MR. RICHARDSON: We have agreed to that.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You have agreed to that?

MR. RICHARDSON: Very definitely, yes as our County Wildlife Federation meeting of the last few days has shown.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: No specific percentage, you are leaving it up to the discretion of the Department?

MR. RICHARDSON: To the discretion of the needs in the Department's operation and, of course, the sportsmen, naturally we think we have a hand in what the Department does.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, I hope you do. Any other questions? How about the pheasant? You wholeheartedly agree with the proposed policy to the Commission that the Department is making on the pheasant program?

MR. RICHARDSON: We very definitely do not.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You definitely do not?

MR. RICHARDSON: We would like to keep all the facilities we have there at present. We don't know whether we can. We are sure going to try. We have had quite a fight in the past to do it but it is sort of one of our lifelines and the people really go for that co-op pheasant program which we have instigated by our own labor in setting up pens, supplying fine monies from the County, fine money, and we have done a lot on our own part to keep it up to now.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Did your Federation read this report or take any action at all?

MR. RICHARDSON: The report has been available in condensed form. I personally have never read the full report or had it available to me where I could, but we have discussed it in some amount but not to any great extent.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Have you taken any action at all?

MR. RICHARDSON: None at all.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Following Mr. Thomas' question, and I don't mean to embarrass you, but is it because the sportsmen, your particular group just as an example, haven't had sufficient time to make an analysis of this report, or do you feel it is too deep in detail as far as technical aspects are concerned, or just why is it that you have not taken any position one way or the other on this Booz, Allen and Hamilton report?

MR. RICHARDSON: It has never been actually delved into by the Federation as a whole to any point where they have come up with any recommendations.

In fact, I guess it is probably like you say. It is pretty deep and most of these men are not auditors. They are just sportsmen of all lines and they don't feel that they can actually make any recommendations.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well then, would you say it would be a fair statement to assume that in view of the fact that the license buyer of the State has expended in the vicinity of \$100,000 for this analysis to be made for the sportsmen and you feel that because of

it being so technical that it is a little difficult for you to decipher to make any specific recommendations that this may be something that you will not go into in the future?

MR. RICHARDSON: No, they probably will delve into it and pass on the recommendations to the California Wildlife Federation.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, of course, as you know, Mr. Richardson, time is of the essence.

MR. RICHARDSON: We know.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Madame Chairman, the reason I asked the question in all fairness, I was trying to find out since 1958 when this report was written as to how many people have read it and how many organizations had actually taken any definite action on some of these recommendations made, and that is the way you get the feeling of the people is by having them testify and we are able to legislate intelligently. This way I haven't been able to find out from anyone.

MR. RICHARDSON: There has been quite a lot of interest in it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: You see when you spent all this money we depend on the reaction of the public and the sportsmen and what reaction comes back to us, why then we generally introduce bills and make changes or make recommendations and this way, why as I see it, I don't think the public is interested in this report. I mean, I am just giving you my own personal observation.

MR. RICHARDSON: I can assure you as far as the recommendations dealing directly with our area, especially on cutbacks of

the catchable trout program and the pheasant program, it has received a great deal of interest.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Senator Erhart.

SENATOR ERHART: Reg, I believe you stated earlier that your group would be willing to use some of the trout money, that is stamp money, the dollar stamp money, to improve streams and lakes. Do you mean just for trout fishing or to improve them as far as warm water fishing is concerned?

MR. RICHARDSON: As far our area itself goes, the amount that we received there in San Diego County is pretty small. It is so in direct relation to where the rest of the money goes. We wouldn't be actually giving away anything, but we do believe that money spent in that way, in stream improvement, especially in the trout program and of course, that would be in other programs, too, I think I know what you mean there, they will conform with it very greatly.

SENATOR ERHART: You then would not object if a portion of this money were used to improve the warm water fishing in your area as well as some of the trout?

MR. RICHARDSON: Well, in our area as far as they were thinking about cutting back on the rough fish in streams, we don't have to worry about that because each year it is taken care of automatically. We have a new stream every year if we have one.

SENATOR ERHART: What about your lakes?

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, they are doing quite a bit of work in that regard.

SENATOR ERHART: You mean in regard to what, trout or warm water fishing?

MR. RICHARDSON: Warm water fishing, poisoning and restocking the lakes and such. I don't think it was brought into the discussion in that way that the money from the trout stamp would be used outside of that area. I don't remember that for sure.

SENATOR ERHART: Would you agree that a dollar spent for trout and a dollar spent for warm water fish, that there would be a lot more fish available if that dollar were spent for warm water fish instead of trout?

MR. RICHARDSON: I don't know.

SENATOR ERHART: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions of the gentleman? If not, thank you very much, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. Ardis Walker, representing the Sportsmen's Council of Central California.

(Thereupon Mr. Walker was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I understand you have some material you are passing around to the committee now. All right, will you be seated and proceed with your testimony.

MR. WALKER: My name is Ardis M. Walker. My address is Box 37, Kernville, California. My testimony is on behalf of the Sportsmen's Council of Central California and my own club, the Kern River Fish and Game Association, a member of that Council.

My council embraces clubs from the Counties of Stanislaus,

Merced, Madera, Fresno, Tulare, Kings, Kern, Monterey, Santa Barbara, San Benito and San Luis. Ranging as it does from Stanislaus County on the north to Kern County on the south, the area involved illustrates rather well the wide range of problems inescapable as diversified as is California.

President Eddie Bruce of the California Wildlife Federation has testified to the three general questions posed by the committee in a manner fairly representative of the groups I represent in this statement. However, because of the diversification of our State, specific problems with respect to fish and game receive varying degrees of attention according to the area involved.

As an example, while our Council advocates habitat improvement and stream rehabilitation to maintain the natural trout fishery still extant in the more northern Sierra, it is faced with the overwhelming pressure of the millions of residents of southern California, whose anglers already have depleted many of our streams to where a catchable trout program must be maintained if such streams are to meet the minimum needs of those anglers.

Likewise, while we worry about deer management and habitat improvement in the Sierras to the east, we have to deal with wide variants of the same problem as well as the question of maintaining a satisfactory ocean fishery on our western boundary.

Because of these varied problems and the ever increasing demands to be met by the limited resources of our area, we cannot envision any general reduction in the cost of maintaining our present program. On the contrary, we feel we must face the fact

that increasing demands of an exploding population can only mean expanded services at greater costs. Fortunately for the sportsmen, he pays his own way through license fees and fine monies, which tend to increase automatically with increased activity in the pursuit of fish and game.

In general we wish to see natural fisheries protected where they still survive and restored where stream improvement is possible. We know, too, that the catchable trout program is here to stay because of public demand in areas of great population and limited water resources. We also feel that increased angling pressures will result in further expansion of the catchable program financed in turn by increased trout stamp sales.

We are convinced that the people who enjoy this program are willing to pay for it. The effect of the California State Water Plan on our fisheries and its potential as a means of supplementing rather than diminishing them is of vital concern to us.

We expect that most of the cost of protecting the interests of sportsmen in this matter will come out of the Fish and Game Department budget.

We favor public land access and the protection of the public in the disposition of public lands having recreation and wildlife habitat values as their highest use. The departmental studies required in solving access problems and insuring practical land withdrawals require expenditures which we feel are wise investments to meet present and future needs.

Our area in general offers poor natural pheasant habitat

and an ever-increasing enthusiasm on the part of mounting hordes of pheasant hunters. We feel that this program should be continued insofar as the hunters are willing to pay for it.

We insist the Department do its utmost in the fight against pollution, knowing full well that cost is a factor here too.

Lastly, we feel that many of the controversial aspects of many of the above programs are based to a great extent on the confusion of ignorance. In every case the sportsman is buying something. In most cases he has no clear idea of all of the cost factors related to his commodity. In other cases, he simply does not really know what he is buying. For that reason, we are willing to pay for a sound program of public enlightenment.

In the field of conservation education, we are sold on the theory that conservation must become a second bible in America if we are to remain solvent in natural resources. We are willing to pay for such protection.

In all of the above investments, however, we are duty bound to scrutinize them as we would our own business ventures. In fact, we feel that each sportsman who purchases a license or a tag is a stockholder in the business of fish and game.

We look to our legislative representatives as we would to a board of directors, and to the Department as we would to employees of the corporation. Because of the interest in our problems shown by your committee, we have confidence in the sincerity and ability of our board of directors. We are convinced of the high level of dedication that goes into the daily services

performed by Department personnel.

However, like all persons engaged in enterprise, we are desirous of the greatest possible dividends at the lowest possible costs. To this end we are happy to aid in such periodic inventories as you may sponsor.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Walker, I would like to ask you a question on page 3. There you state that in every case the sportsman is buying something. Then you go on further to say in most cases he has no clear idea of all of the cost factors related to his commodity. Why doesn't he know?

MR. WALKER: Well, mainly for the same reason that I think you haven't had too explosive a reaction to the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report, because as has been stated before many of the sportsmen are interested in the commodity but they are not qualified as accountants and they have not followed through the channels of the budgeting and they are not too familiar with it.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well then, would you say that it might have been wise for them to engage somebody that might be able to interpret this for them, such as the California Wildlife Federation so that they could have come to some decision either pro or con on this \$100,000 expenditure?

MR. WALKER: This \$100,000 expenditure, I think, was not particularly the choice of the sportsmen.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: It was the license buyers' money.

MR. WALKER: It was their money that was used. It was not their investment in a sense it was a legislative act.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I don't recall that they opposed it. They may have without my knowledge, but I don't recall that they opposed it. So evidently, if people are silent on a particular point, I assume they support things if they don't come forward and say they are against anything. Now, you go on to say, "For this reason, we are willing to pay for a sound program of public enlightenment. In the field of conservation education, we are sold on the theory that conservation must become a second bible in America if we are to remain solvent in natural resources." I certainly concur with that statement, but you certainly recognize that the trout program to a great portion and the pheasant program is an artificial program and not a conservation program, do you not?

MR. WALKER: We are not confusing "put-and-take" programs with necessary conservation education. I would say this, however, in the case of the trout program and also the pheasant program, there is a secondary conservation value involved, and in the fact that people who are hunting pheasants, and I will say they rush to the kill like it is a Mexican revolution when there are pheasants to be shot - you can go quietly out into the hills and hunt quail and they are not taking that beating. They do save on some of the natural resources.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, but that line is very finely drawn. To a great extent it is a "put-and-take" program.

MR. WALKER: It is directly, but indirectly it does save on natural production.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you feel that the natural production is being given the attention that it should as far as the improving of its habitat?

MR. WALKER: I would say that in this field we are not reaching the ultimate that we should reach including that field.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You feel more attention should be stressed upon improvement of natural habitat?

MR. WALKER: I would say more attention could be stressed on many things. I wouldn't make it a comparative statement. I am sure as I have said in my statement, there is going to be an increasing demand for "put-and-take" and there is also going to be an increasing need for "stream improvement and our council is working in both fields.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you say that an assumption somewhat along this basis, that if the habitat were improved in areas where the native trout reside that that would actually assist the "put-and-take" program as far as another area of the State so that it could take care of the growing increase in population without too much cost?

MR. WALKER: Well, I would say this. I am sitting right on probably one of the hottest "put-and-take" streams in the State, a stream which by the way has not had its natural condition altered to any extent so that you don't have to go in there and rehabilitate that stream if that would be it. But the native trout is gone in that stream because of roadside fishing and I think where you have roadside fishing and big populations, you

are never going to be able to bring back a native fishery through stream improvement.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, I recognize your area but I am speaking of areas that are not in the same category as yours. They don't receive the heavy pressure that the area you have reference to does.

MR. WALKER: I would say there is certainly - we are all working toward more stream improvement in areas away from roadside fishing. I don't think it is going to do too much good on those areas because you are going to have too much of a take.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: When you say, "We are all working", who is "we"?

MR. WALKER: I would say our council. For instance, it was some time ago when I took Mr. Horn when I was with the Wildlife Resources Commission into an area where the natural spawning had been destroyed by a logging operation and at that time I remember asking him how much it would cost the State to rehabilitate such streams and he said it would cost millions of dollars. He said, "In fact, this is very tame compared with what we are faced with in northern California." So it indicates that is a problem up and down the State.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions? Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: You mention the fact that the extreme fishing pressure on some streams has almost completely done away with the wild trout and these streams are entirely dependent on the catchable trout program. Now, you must therefore feel that

any cutback in the catchable trout program would certainly have an adverse effect on the streams that have been affected in this way?

MR. WALKER: It certainly would.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Is this limited just to these streams or do you think it might have a cumulative effect?

MR. WALKER: I think it would have a cumulative effect and in a sense this is more or less a hearing on the finances relative to the Department. I would like to make this observation that that is another thing I have been able to watch first hand and I have talked to a lot of people who fish for catchable fish and many of those people that I have talked to, if that program were eliminated and they could not enjoy fishing, the only kind of fishing they could have say within three hours' drive of Los Angeles, they wouldn't even buy licenses and therefore the Department would not only lose the stamps involved, but they would lose the full five dollar investment, so that there is a relation there that definitely should be considered.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: In other words, you have to maintain some level or possibility of success?

MR. WALKER: So that those people will buy not only fishing licenses but the trout stamps.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Allen.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Mr. Walker, you have expressed a philosophy here this afternoon which is really refreshing. I want to find out in just plain unvarnished language that what we have had in the past in the way of thoughtless logging operations

of a natural resource can only be used as experience. We are going to have to go into sooner or later the recreation concept, isn't that true?

MR. WALKER: We already have done that.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: And we are going to have to pay for it.

MR. WALKER: And we are going to have to pay for it just as we pay to go a show.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: In other words, this silver platter give away program that we have had heretofore has not been entirely satisfactory and has not accomplished the job?

MR. WALKER: That is right, and I think that is why the organized sportsmen asked for a raise in their own fees here a couple of years ago.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: In other words, what you are trying to tell this committee as near as I can gather, because I am going to be interested in this Wednesday when I am going to have to talk on this subject, what you are trying to tell this committee is that you feel people want a realistic pricing of this because as you know the five or three dollar license is only the beginning for a man will invest three or four hundred dollars in hunting equipment.

Before we commit ourselves, those of us who desire that, before we commit ourselves to the larger expenditure we want to know what the cost is going to be to provide the recreation or the resource in reasonable expected quantities. Is my interpretation of your statement here wrong?

MR. WALKER: No, it is not. I think the sportsmen are interested in that cost, too. That is why we are here, why this meeting is called by this committee, because we know this is a committee called generally for that purpose.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Since we have increased the fees do the sportsmen of your organization feel that they are getting their money out of their investment or getting some value out of it?

MR. WALKER: Could I say this--

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Are you satisfied with it?

MR. WALKER: I think generally speaking they are, yes. If it had been otherwise I don't think they would have gone along with the proposed programs that have been submitted to the Commission.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: And my last question - I don't know whether it is pertinent or not - but I would like to know what is the feeling of the sportsmen? Is the Department doing a good job? Do you have confidence in them?

MR. WALKER: I would say generally speaking the sportsmen do have confidence in the Department. I have worked with many members of the Department. This last summer I participated in a stream survey with members of the Department and in my contact with the Department to this extent I feel that they have some very fine professional people and I think one of the big problems is to let those people accomplish a great deal. In other words, let the

facts fall where they may but let those people accomplish their professional service.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: We have to be fair in giving the new appointees the opportunity the next couple of years to prove that they have a good program. We just can't expect a new appointee to do a lot of programming without time, and I think that is why the Governor appointed experienced men, career people with the backgrounds they have.

MR. WALKER: I think it was a very refreshing precedent.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Just one further question, Mr. Walker, while we are on this concept. Would it be remiss in your opinion, and I am asking you for your opinion, if in the event that we must go to the private producers of these fish and find that private producers can furnish them at a more reasonable rate than they can be under our terms of civil service, what is your opinion about going to the game bird breeders and also the fish hatchery people?

MR. WALKER: You are asking me for my personal opinion since it is not covered in our paper. I would say I think those sportsmen and I know in my case if it can be shown to me that they can meet specification requirements and can do it cheaper than the sportsmen would be foolish to have the money spent any other way, but I think it doesn't just go - you can't just merely say anymore than you can in business that because you get a lower price you are getting a qualified product in some cases.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: I mean the standards must be maintained,

of course.

MR. WALKER: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: In other words, the sportsmen's dollar goes into many other fields and there is a greater expense than the mere buying of a license.

MR. WALKER: I will agree with you there. I have seen sportsmen when we first raised these fees a little bit would cry all night about a two dollar increase and spend fifty dollars buying rounds of drinks while they did it.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Isn't it true that the true test of a good sportsman is his inability to walk by a sporting goods store without buying something?

MR. WALKER: That is a true statement. That is what makes it a big industry in California.

SENATOR ERHART: The area that you represent, the counties that you represent, have a considerable warm water fishery?

MR. WALKER: That is right.

SENATOR ERHART: Do you think the Department is spending sufficient money on warm water to promote warm water fisheries? Do you think they should spend more? Do you think probably we could satisfy a great many of these trout fishermen, especially the younger fishermen that are coming up, in fishing for warm water fish than trout, that it would be a lot less expensive?

MR. WALKER: You asked me if I thought they were spending enough for that?

SENATOR ERHART: Yes.

MR. WALKER: I would say fortunately on warm water fishing it doesn't take too much financing. My observation on Lake Isabella indicates they have done a terrific job. There are literally tons of fish taken out of that on a weekend sometimes.

SENATOR ERHART: And don't you think it satisfies a great many of the sportsmen, the fishermen?

MR. WALKER: It certainly does. If it weren't for the warm water fishery adjacent to the Kern River on opening day you would have more than one fist fight over a rock because they actually have fist fights over rocks on opening day.

SENATOR ERHART: I used to think that I wasn't satisfied unless I had a trout on the end of my line, but I have found out I can have a lot of sport catching bass or even bluegill. It is a lot of fun.

MR. WALKER: That is especially true of family parties and youngsters.

SENATOR ERHART: I think we should do more towards developing our warm water fisheries.

MR. WALKER: That is why we are all for whatever it costs to have qualified men protect our interests on water development.

SENATOR ERHART: I agree with you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I would like to ask you one last question as far as I am concerned. If in the year 1961-62 the Department should be faced with a possible need for additional revenues, if they find themselves in the position where the population forces them to request an expansion of this program, would you be adverse

to an increase in the fishing and hunting license?

MR. WALKER: I personally would not. In that I am not speaking for someone else except generally speaking the council feels that the pressure will to a great extent take care of the additional costs through additional sales or licenses and so forth.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I see. All right. Thank you. Our next witness is Mr. George Difani speaking in behalf of the Fresno County Sportsmen's Club.

(Thereupon Mr. Difani was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You may proceed.

MR. DEFANI: Madame Chairman and members of the committee and ladies and gentlemen, my name is George D. Difani. I am Executive Secretary of the California Wildlife Federation. I have been requested to present the following statement for the Fresno County Sportsmen's Club by Les Ellis, Director and Past President.

This letter was directed to the Commission in reference to the trout policy, so it is before the Fish and Game Commission now for discussion and action.

"Our executive committee reviewed the proposed 'trout production policy' prepared by the Department of Fish and Game for the Fish and Game Commission to consider adopting at its meeting of December 3rd, 1959.

"We interpret the proposal as restricting the annual cost of the trout hatchery program, not including fingerlings, to equal

the annual revenue from the trout anglers through the sale of trout stamps.

"We consider this amount to be in the neighborhood of \$675,000 based on the Department's many surveys indicating consistently that half of the fishermen who buy a license are trout anglers, the total number of licenses being sold annually at present being about 1,350,000. One-half of this amount would be 675,000 or that many dollars being made available for the catchable size trout production program.

"Our executive committee voted favorably on this proposal but feel that other gauges should be established for additional fishery programs.

"In other words, what are the plans, and to what extent will projects be undertaken for: (1) Stream improvement. (2) Lake improvement. (3) Introduction of new species of game and forage fish. (4) Fertilization of fishing waters. (5) Specific projects to improve warm water fisheries. (6) Specific projects to improve ocean fisheries, to name only a few.

"If anglers paid in \$675,000 for trout stamps, they would've from necessity, had to pay in an equal amount for stamps to take inland fish other than trout. Shouldn't this amount be earmarked for what it was paid in for?

"If the Commission intends to continue the year round trout fishing season in southern California but only from May to October in the north, we object to the planting of catchable size trout except during the so-called summer trout season. The

organized sportsmen of the State went along with the year round trout fishing proposal of the southern California sportsmen due to water conditions but with the exclusive understanding that no trout would be planted except during the same months that trout were planted in the north.

"This has not been the practice and State funds paid in by sportsmen for the good and welfare of fishing and hunting on a statewide basis are being used for the year round benefit of southern California trout anglers in contrast to six months for the northern trout fisherman.

"This letter was read and unanimously approved by our Board of Directors on November 19th, 1959."

May I say, Madame Chairman, that G. W. Philpott, who has appeared before this committee on other occasions passed away very recently. If he hadn't passed away he would have been here to make this statement for the Fresno Sportsmen's Club.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I understand and as a matter of fact I want to suggest at this time that when we recess at the end of our deliberations for today until tomorrow morning, that we do so in memory of Mr. Philpott, who has certainly devoted many hours of his life to fish and game conservation.

Any questions of Mr. Difani?

MR. DIFANI: Could I make one observation, my own personal observation? I am quite intrigued with what Senator Erhart has had to say on numerous occasions. I would like to take this opportunity to comment that I personally from quite a few years

of experience in this warm water fishing program am aware of the potential that can be established by its development to take care of the ever-increasing number of anglers that are coming to the State, and it is a program that if the Department will supply the funds necessary to develop it, it will take a terrific lot of pressure off the trout angling and the highways to the Sierras and so forth and do innumerable things to relieve and provide better fishing for more people at a lot less cost. We have been continually emphasizing this and we feel that, and I am sure that particularly the valleys, both the San Joaquin Valley and the Sacramento Valley organizations, feel that there is a terrific potential that isn't now producing warm water fishing to the extent that it would take care of the people who would use it and many of the new people in our State are people who have come here from parts of the United States who have had nothing but warm water fishing in the past and they would accept it and we would not have to, you might say, convert them to catchable trout anglers.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Is that the subject or the item we were talking about this morning?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: This is my understanding. Mr. Shannon, will you clarify that again?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: That was the \$70,000 item.

MR. SHANNON: That was the \$81,000 with which we proposed to put more emphasis on the warm water and these new reservoirs that are in existence and will be under construction.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Is that enough to do the job? I thought you said \$70,000. Okeh, \$81,000, is that enough money to do a good job?

MR. SHANNON: \$81,000, it is certainly a start. This is a yearly program. We plan to continue this in future years, of course, and one of the things that we have to do is get the answers before we jump in clear above our heads. We want to get the answers on how to improve these reservoirs.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Have there been any recommendations made by sports organizations of how you can improve the warm water fisheries?

MR. DIFANI: You have asked me that question?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I am asking Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: Well, we have various suggestions from time to time and most of them are suggestions which are in line with channels that we are looking into. Sometimes we get suggestions that we are not quite ready to adopt because they may be either too far ahead of us or we don't feel we have enough information to justify any expenditure of money along those lines, but in addition to this proposed program, we are expending quite a little money right now on warm water fisheries and the importation of new fish and we introduced, as I spoke about, we introduced the thread-fin shad and exotic fish to try to fill up the gaps in these reservoirs and places where no fishing exists now.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, may I make an observation here that even though I for one am very much in favor of enhancing the warm

water fishery to take the pressure off the trout program which is very costly, I still think that in the year 1961-62 that we should not in any way misconstrue the possibility of having to raise additional license fees to take care of this expanding program even though it is very necessary.

This is the point I think very factually that we must recognize, that there is that possibility. We just can't say that that is not going to be the case as we have been reading in some of the news articles. We have to look at least three or four years ahead, it seems to me, in any fish and game program when you go into an expansion of a program. Is that not correct, Mr. Shannon?

MR. SHANNON: I don't think you can say that there never will be another increase in license fees. As the state population grows, and there are more and more demands eventually that may be. As we see it now in our proposed budget for 1960-61 that does not and will not necessitate an increase in fees dependent upon what happens with our 1960-61 budget. When we request our 1961-62 budget we have got to still stay in the black. There may be a license increase sometime in the future but within the foreseeable future, the next few years, we don't see the need for a license increase. If the public demands a real expansion in some programs, a heavy expansion, then there may be a need.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, I just wanted to make note that all the different people that have come before this committee today and testified in behalf of the council members didn't seem too

adverse to this possibility because I have been trying to point out to them that this might become a reality. No one knows, but certainly it is very possible so I would assume that the Legislature would be quite safe in saying that there wouldn't be any opposition from the sportsmen's organization at the time that a license increase might be before us. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Allen.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Directing your attention to the reservoir, Mr. Shannon, that was built over in Whittier Narrows, can't there be some object lessons drawn from your experience over there where you had the catchable trout and they didn't survive but the warm water fish are more or less plentiful? That is, warm water fish do survive and also increase in that body of water?

MR. SHANNON: Well, this is an area that really fell outside of what we normally consider trout waters. It was in a pretty metropolitan area and as a result we did not favor the planting of catchable trout, "put-and-take" stocking in there.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Just one little second here. You did put the catchable trout in there and then we had to beat at your door like irate unpaid landlords in order to get you to put in the warm water fish, if you will remember.

MR. SHANNON: We put in--

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Not you, but I mean Seth Gordon.

MR. SHANNON: Rather than try to expound on this, I know that we put some catchable trout in and then warm water fish

eventually, and I am not too sure what the sequence was here or how many of each we put in. If you would like to pursue this, I would like to turn it over to Alex Calhoun who has more detail on this than I have.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: It proves in that type of operation it is useless to try to put catchable trout in there. In other words, it would give you an argument for your warm water fish, it seems to me. I think that is going to be the only salvation down there as soon as these different flood control channels and some of these other places are developed to the point where we do have these reservoirs.

MR. SHANNON: Sir, I believe the county furnished some money for stocking there, too.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Yes. One other phase in that situation that probably Mrs. Davis is highly unaware of is the number of ponds throughout the Los Angeles area and some in San Bernardino, especially around - I think Miss Kral could probably identify them far more readily. I know one up near Hesperia and others where you have a privately operated fishing situation where these people take their kids to fish so they can actually catch a certain few trout. That is becoming more and more prevalent in southern California. That seems to be our answer.

MR. SHANNON: We have quite a few of those throughout the State. I know the plant you are talking about and also the one up in Mill Creek Canyon and various other plants like that where people get their fish through commercial enterprise like that and

fish for trout. We have quite a few of them throughout the State.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Some of those boys are doing all right, aren't they?

MR. SHANNON: You mean the fishermen or the owners?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: The owners.

MR. SHANNON: Sometimes, yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask you, Mr. Shannon, how much money do you have in this fiscal budget for the clearance of rough fish?

MR. SHANNON: I will have to ask Mr. Anderson for those figures.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Anderson, can you answer that question for me?

MR. ANDERSON: Madame Chairman, and members of the committee, for clearing rough fish speaking strictly of chemicals, I would estimate \$30,000 to \$35,000 approximately.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you think that is adequate?

MR. ANDERSON: This is for chemical treatment.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How about the other? Taking into consideration all other methods that you use for clearing rough fish, what are they? Will you go into a little detail on it?

MR. ANDERSON: As far as the chemical treatment is concerned, this is a program that started a number of years ago and it has been gradually increasing. In addition to the Department spending money on this program, there has also been considerable amount of county fund money been made available in cooperation with the Department in this chemical treatment program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do the counties contact you relative to this program or do you solicit their support if they have any finances they are willing to spend as far as their fine monies are concerned on a clearance program?

MR. ANDERSON: We do not go out and solicit. Most of it is arrived at by cooperative approach with local sportsmen.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, Mr. Shannon, may I ask you, do you ever plant trout, catchable trout in a lake or in a stream which is quite highly infested with rough fish?

MR. SHANNON: There are times when we do, yes. The percentage of rough fish we don't always know. In fact without population surveys and samplings, and we can't afford to do that on every lake - we generally go on the basis that if there is a return of 50% or more of the fish we plant, then we are getting an adequate return. In some cases it runs as high as 85% or so of return of the fish we plant. We can't always be sure just what the population of rough fish is in a particular lake, but we do use as guide lines the fact that we have to get at least 50% or more of those fish back.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well now, let me ask you this question. If you are quite aware that there is somewhat of an abundance of rough fish in an area that you are going to plant and this actually has occurred in my own district, I might say, do you think it is wise to plant catchable fish in there, and particularly fingerlings which you have done in some cases?

MR. SHANNON: It depends upon the return more I think. If

we get an adequate return, and I am speaking about the fisherman. If the fisherman gets an adequate return, I think we are justified in planting. Now, this lake treatment, there are a lot of factors to be taken into consideration. In other words, there are certain lakes that can only be treated at certain times. We generally wait until the lake is being drained or is low on account of weather conditions and try to treat at that time. Now, sometimes there are lakes where there are considerable numbers of rough fish, but we can't treat this lake for two or three years. In some cases we know that we are planting trout in waters where there are a considerable number of rough fish, but we still go on the basis of getting an adequate return, and then when the time is ripe we treat the lake.

For instance, lots of times we confer with Pacific Gas and Electric Company several years in advance and they say, "Well, in the year 1963 we plan on dropping this lake down to one-fifth of what it is now because we want to fix our dam. We want to do certain repair work on the facilities." We wait until that time and we treat the lake at a very small amount, whereas if we try to treat it now it would run into ten times as much for treatment.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Now since the water table and level has been low throughout the entire State, which you know, knowing some of the areas that I feel need this attention even in my own Assembly District, do you feel that the amount of money that you have in the fiscal budget is going to be adequate, I mean wouldn't this be an opportune time to really take advantage of the

low level of the water table?

MR. SHANNON: I think that I can't say that this entirely adequate. This was based on what our regional people felt they needed as far as lake treatment was concerned for the year 1960-61. Now, the year 1960-61, in that year the water table or water level might be much higher than it is now. This \$35,000 or in that neighborhood for chemical treatment alone will do quite a bit of treatment work. This I understand does not include salaries and boats and everything else that we use in connection with such treatment. It is for chemicals alone, so this provides quite a bit of chemical and if the year 1960-61 should be one of those years where the lakes would really be low, it might be desirable to try to get more money during that period for such treatment.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You are aware the lakes are low this year. Certainly we haven't had any moisture in our area and I know lakes that should be tended to now. Are you saying at some future date when the lakes are low - they are low this year, you know.

MR. SHANNON: I know they are low in many cases. What I mean by low, as far as chemical treatment is concerned, is where they really drop a lake down to practically nothing. Now, some of the lakes are in that condition and should be treated and our plans call for treatment of these lakes in such instances during this year.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Difani, do you have any other statement that you would like to make?

MR. DIFANI: I have a personal observation I would like to give the committee. The Lake Cachuma project in Santa Barbara County is a good example of a lake producing good warm water fishing where the local residents thought at the time it should be planted to trout. The Department held out for warm water fish and now the local people are convinced it is providing hours and hours of angling with good success with warm water species.

On the other hand I would like to tell Mr. Allen that the State of Colorado has hundreds of small lakes operated on a private enterprise basis that provide trout angling for the public. They are very successful and are well patronized and I believe because they stay in business they must be making a profit.

Now, I would like to also say in closing that the California Wildlife Federation must take the responsibility for supporting and actually urging the enactment of the legislation to have this Booz, Allen and Hamilton survey. I think the fact has been brought out here and in other hearings that the Department has taken about 200 of the suggestions and is putting them into actual use and they are going to adopt them and I think that is pretty much proof of the survey's value. I have read the report and I am in hopes that our federation will take some concrete action on some of the things other than the 200 recommendations that the Department have already adopted. There are some other good things in it. There are some things I am sure our organization will not buy, but I think that is rather normal also. But by and large I think that personally the survey was worth what

it cost and I am only hopeful that our group can come to the final decision or any decision in reference to some other decisions that are going to be made or that you people are going to discuss. Vince Thomas has mentioned that he wonders whether we have taken this thing in stride and whether it is worth what it cost. I would like to answer that and I think I have pointed out what has been done and the report as Mr. Gray gave it this morning in reference to the recommendation of the fish eradication program in warm water areas is being adopted. It is something I am sure all our councils are in favor of and that alone is to get that movement started and get it really moving and that is something that is absolutely necessary and we have the support of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton people and the consultants were employed to come here from other states, experts that determined those things on the basis of on the ground surveys.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions of Mr. Defani? If not, thank you very much, George. Now, we have one last witness today on a little different subject matter, but it involves financing. Mr. Joe Borden, will you come forward, representing the Trinity County Sportsmen's Association, and I understand Mr. Borden is primarily interested in having some assistance for predatory control.

(Thereupon Mr. Borden was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

MR. BORDEN: Madame Chairman and members of the committee, I am Joe Borden. I have been sent here today as chairman of a

committee representing the Trinity County Sportsmen's Association. As you have been told, we are going to make a change in topic here and approach the subject from a little different angle. At this time, with your permission, I would first like to thank the members of the committee for agreeing to stay just a little longer. It does mean a great deal to us. It means that we will get home just that much sooner and we won't have to stay an extra day, but I am one of the five who have come down here from Trinity County today and I would like to introduce the other four members of this committee that are here with me. They will stand by to answer questions and to help out with the testimony that we want to bring you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You may proceed to introduce them and if they have to answer any questions, we will put them under oath.

MR. BORDEN: First, I would like to introduce Harold Wilson, sheriff of Trinity County, past president of the Trinity County Sportsmen's Association and for four years secretary of that association. He is also director of the Trinity County Cattlemen's Association and a member of the California Cattlemen's Association. Mr. Wilson, will you please stand so you may be identified.

Then I would like to introduce James Lee, cattleman and vice chairman of the Trinity County Cattlemen's Association, also a director of the Northern Counties Wildlife Conservation Association, a member of the California Cattlemen's Association, and vice chairman of the Trinity County Cattlemen's Association.

And then I would like to introduce Roy Gallagher, supervisor

of the Fifth District in Trinity County, a member of the Trinity County Sportsmen's Association, and also a member of the Trinity County Cattlemen's Association.

And then I would like to introduce Fred Olsen of Trinity County, a well-known hunter and trapper of that area and also a cattleman. As you notice, all these men are sportsmen, but in addition to being sportsmen they are also interested in the livestock industry of Trinity County.

Now, the testimony that we would like to present here today is repetitious to some extent of what was presented here last spring, mainly that we feel we have evidence that too many predatory animals in our County are definitely interfering with the development and production of wild land recreation and livestock of our area. I feel that Trinity County is one that is coming here today not so much to criticize but to ask for help.

We are a sparsely populated area. We are in many respects a poverty area. We do need help from the outside.

On the other hand three-quarters of our land area is owned by the Federal Government. I think there are valuable stakes here to be taken care of. Certainly we are the heart of the wild land and as most of you know the wild land is rapidly becoming California's number one asset. We feel that more scientific management is definitely needed in our area.

Now, I have to present here today for the record and we would like to turn this over for the records a testimonial from a trapper in our area. This is a signed statement which has been

notarized. It is written by Frank Wilburn. He says:

"I, Frank Wilburn, have been a trapper twenty years in the Mad River area. I was retired from this work ten years ago. It is my observation that the coyotes are increasing fast in Ruth, Mad River and South Fork mountain areas. They are killing a lot of deer, included many big bucks. I have seen bones from deer killed by coyotes all around the country. In Hidden Valley the other day I saw a coyote chasing a big calf."

That is a personal statement made by Frank Wilburn, a thirty year trapper and a native of the area. I would also like to present this testimonial that was given to me by Ted Shannon of the Hoaglin area. Mr. Shannon was born and has spent most of his life in this area. He is a farmer and logger but is now very much interested in trying to develop the wild land recreation on his land and surrounding country. Good hunting is an important part of this development. Ted Shannon and his two sons, Carlton and Ray, all gave testimony of how too many coyotes were interfering with good hunting. Mr. Shannon was quoted as follows, "Any time of the year you can find dead carcasses of deer killed by coyotes in the Salt Creek or Rock Creek area. It is common to see five or six dead deer on a five mile hike. Two seasons ago we killed two coyotes while riding into the McCulloch property on a hunt. Last season we killed three coyotes on this same ride.

"This last week we observed three deer carcasses on a one-mile ride. They were all fairly fresh kill. We figured coyotes had killed them."

Now, included in these testimonials there was a telegram that arrived from Humboldt County.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, may I read it at this time?

MR. BORDEN: Yes, would you please?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: For the record, it says,

"Regret that no Humboldt wool grower will be able to attend your hearing on fish and game activities on January 18-19. All of them most vitally interested but are actively engaged in lambing under adverse weather conditions and trying to prevent coyotes from destroying their 1960 lamb crop. The consensus of telephone poll today of the wool growers most affected by the increasing predator population in eastern Humboldt is that Fish and Game should assume its fair share of suppression of predators on public lands by actively doing so as in past or make available to other governmental agencies sufficient funds to do the job. Fish and Game by refusing to undertake adequate measures for predator control is shirking its responsibility to the general public in allowing infection reservoirs for rabies to be maintained and increased to say nothing of protected breeding grounds for predators who will destroy the livelihood to taxpaying wool growers. We respectfully request that this telegram be included in the minutes of your hearing January 18-19 respectfully."

This is signed by Ed Wagoner, President Humboldt County Wool Growers Association.

MR. BORDEN: Thank you, Madame Chairman, and I would also like to ask if Mr. Toobie is in the audience. I don't know

Mr. Toobie too well. I don't think he is here. He represents a livestockman who operates on the border between Trinity and Humboldt Counties. I would like to make this statement that we are primarily concerned today in this testimony with coyotes and bobcats and the damage they do to deer and sheep.

I would like to just write in this bit of testimony that comes from Leonard Miller of Lake Mountain in Trinity County. Mr. Miller has lived in this area since 1919. The following quotation was used at the hearing, "For three years in a row we lost practically 100% of our lamb crop. This forced us out of the sheep business. For the last three years we have had no sheep on our property and are no longer interested."

The point here is that there is much evidence to indicate that the sheep business of Trinity has gone to the coyotes long ago. I am sure that at least three of these four men that are with me today could get up and testify that they some time ago decided that they couldn't raise sheep in Trinity County and have gone out of business. However, there are large herds on this border between Trinity and Humboldt and these men are willing to bring in testimony to the fact of the damage that has been done in that area and I know that that has been presented before.

Figures taken from the census show that Trinity County had 6,103 sheep in 1950 and the latest I have is 1955, but that population is only half what it was in 1950, 2,712. And certainly this decrease, although it has been caused by other factors, still predators have had an important part.

Now, I would like - that about concludes what I have to present here today, but I would like to ask a question, if I may at this time.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Of one of the members of the Department of Fish and Game?

MR. BORDEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you direct your question to me?

MR. BORDEN: I would direct it to you, Madame Chairman. We would like to ask how much money has been appropriated to Trinity County as a result of the passing of Resolution 40 last May, I think it was, or last year we will say?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, Mr. Shannon, you no doubt heard the question.

MR. SHANNON: As a result of the Resolution introduced, I believe by Senator Christensen, we have been negotiating with the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide additional money for predator control. This is in the amount of \$25,000.

This agreement is now in the hands of the Department of Finance for their approval. It has been tentatively approved by United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department, so that while it is not specifically stated in this agreement, arrangements have been made with the Fish and Wildlife to provide additional trapping activity in Trinity County as a result of this agreement.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, this cooperative program that you are talking about for this area, what other counties will it incorporate? Will you explain how large the territory is, the

distance that this man is going to have to cover as far as predator control is concerned.

MR. SHANNON: There would be more than one man. This money would help finance a predatory animal control program of the Fish and Wildlife Service and we have asked that particular attention be given to several counties that appeared in relation to Senator Christensen's resolution. One was Trinity, another was Humboldt, and some other counties were involved.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: These people aren't full time employees?

MR. SHANNON: They would be full time employees of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, for the Fish and Wildlife Service, but not particularly full time as far as the interest of the State Department of Fish and Game as far as predatory control is concerned.

MR. SHANNON: We would supply them the money and they would hire as many people as the \$25,000 would provide. They would hire as many people as they could at their prevailing rate and put them on duty and we have requested particular attention be given to these counties that I have mentioned.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you think that \$25,000 is adequate?

MR. SHANNON: It depends on what you mean by adequate. This is a rather large field. In general years ago we had a predatory animal control program that ranged between \$200,000 and \$300,000 with some 30 or more employees as full time trappers.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes. Why did you dispose of that program,

Mr. Shannon?

MR. SHANNON: We reduced our program because in line with modern game management practices it was determined through investigation that we weren't getting our money's worth. It was a situation where the expenditure of money was not producing a return in terms of game.

Now, granted that the farmer has a problem in relation to sheep and cattle, but the primary responsibility of the Department of Fish and Game is to protect the deer and the wild game and not in relation to the farmer's cattle and sheep. The United States Fish and Wildlife generally assumes this responsibility.

I would like to read a few excerpts from the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report on predatory animal control. They recommended the abolishment of the remaining lion hunter positions. They also say in relation to coyotes that it is now recognized by game managers that food supply and not predators determines the abundance of small animals, that widespread coyote control cannot be justified economically for wildlife alone.

Then another recommendation is that we contribute financially to the United States Fish and Wildlife coyote control program which we are doing and have an agreement in process.

The general recommendation of Booz, Allen and Hamilton people in relation to predator control in general states:

"Use predator control only when and where studies show that game is being damaged severely. Predator control should be considered a minor management tool to be used only when and where

studies show that game is being seriously damaged." We cannot show in California where game is being seriously damaged through lack of predator control.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, Mr. Shannon, of course I might say that you and I, as you well know, have a difference of opinion on this predator control program and we had a little problem in Plumas County, and I think probably my suggestion to Trinity County would be for the County Board of Supervisors to take under consideration the employment of a county trapper in their own county, the same as Plumas did, and even though we didn't further this endeavor because we were able to encourage Mr. Montgomery to leave Mr. Foster there as a permanent trapper, and I requested each time he take him out of the area to work on any other program he write my office and indicate to me why he was taking him out of there and for what period of time and for what reason. Upon that basis we are having quite a satisfactory predator control program in Plumas County and Sierra and through that area. I might suggest this to Trinity County. I feel that there is a real need for a State employee. If you are going to put any additional staff on in your Department, it seems to me this is one area that you can certainly expand upon because the cooperation with Fish and Wildlife Service in this particular instance has been good, but it hasn't been adequate.

Those people are having a real serious problem there and I think I certainly echo the feelings of Senator Regan in this manner, too, and I see the gentleman nodding his head. Now, I would like to

at this time, because I was interested in this problem, have Mr. Scheuermann state for the record the conversation between Mr. Ross from Region I in Redding on this particular problem.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: Well, after these gentlemen called our office to see if they could get on the agenda, I called Region I headquarters to see what the situation was so we could be more fully informed and I talked to Fred Ross who is the Game Management Supervisor for Region I and asked him what personnel they had working in predator control at that time and what their plans were and what his feelings were on the program in the county. He said they apparently had none, but they had proceeded with a contract with the Fish and Wildlife Service for an eight months part time program, but the contract had not yet gone through and it was Fred's opinion that it was on the Fish and Wildlife Service's nonacceptance of it at this time.

MR. SHANNON: Well, we had quite a little bit of negotiation with the Fish and Wildlife and that has been ironed out and so he probably was not aware that the agreement is in the hands of the Department of Finance waiting their approval, and as soon as it is approved there why we will go to work. The money is in the budget.

MR. SCHEUERMANN: He further said that the Fish and Wildlife Service presently have two full time people in the southern end of the county and one part time in that area in conjunction with Humboldt County and they have none now in the northern part of Trinity County and it was Ross' statement that it was his opinion that the northern end of the county did not feel this predator

control work was needed because the deer in some of the more remote areas were underharvested anyway.

MR. SHANNON: I don't think that disagrees with what we said.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In other words, what you are saying, Mr. Shannon, is that if there are predators left to roam they will decrease some of the deer herds for you. Is that a proper assumption?

MR. SHANNON: They will always kill deer to some extent, predators will. Lions will and coyotes will.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And also sheep.

MR. SHANNON: And sheep and calves. Now, I am not in saying this precluding the fact that the farmers and the stockmen have a problem with predators. I agree that they do, but insofar as the deer population and our wild game population as it exists now is concerned, the expenditure of any material amount of money on predator control will not produce results. Granted that the predators do take some deer, but they do not have a serious effect on the deer population. Now, if we get into the stage where we have a high harvest of deer and a heavily managed deer population in certain areas where we want to preserve the utmost for the sportsmen, then we could spend more money in that particular area on predator control in relation to that particular population, but where you are only harvesting seven or eight per cent of the deer herd and you could harvest 25 or 30%, the number of deer that is taken by predators is not reducing the deer population so that any-

body need worry about it.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Madame Chairman, why can't the people of both Humboldt and Trinity take a page out of the Nebraska situation where they had a tremendous situation of that nature. They got ahold of motel keepers and various other people who would have some material benefit and they put up suitable trophies and they put up various other things and enticed a bunch of sportsmen to come out from Omaha under the control of game wardens. They had a predator drive about twice a year and got rid of quite a few of them. It got to the point where they actually made dough out of it. That may sound a little off to you folks, but if you use your imagination I suppose if I had a motel up there in that neighborhood and you had an enterprising person that could bring them up and get the sportsmen together under firearm control and safety regulations, it would be an opportune time to train them and you could get these people.

I was hoping Mr. Bruce would stick around to get this. I have discussed this since our last spring session and I wrote to your sheep men and I also wrote your cattlemen and, of course, they gave me the fine courtesy of not even answering the letter. It was a suggestion and you have to exercise some resourcefulness. I think you could have a series of these shoots under control. We have got guys down in Los Angeles actually wanting something to shoot at. We have doctors shooting their wives.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think, Mr. Allen, we are getting a little off the subject.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: You are on predator control.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: The part about doctors' wives being predators--

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: I would say it would be a beneficial situation to take these people out under a control situation and let them actually shoot in the field and give them an opportunity. I know there are people down there that would go out on such a predator control program.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: The most intelligent thing I have heard.

MR. BORDEN: Madame Chairman, could I call on one of my fellow county men, Mr. Lee. The four who are with me here represent four corners of the county.

(Thereupon Mr. Lee was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

MR. LEE: I would like to answer Mr. Allen up there. I don't know whether Mr. Allen has ever been in Trinity County.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: I have been up there on several interim committees in years gone by. It is a wild country.

MR. LEE: Not only wild country but we have a recreation that is only there about three months of the year. The resorts are open about three months of the year. Most of the time we are snowbound and as far as bringing in your men to hunt and trap down coyotes, I think it is a ridiculous thing. I think the Fish and Game at the present time have qualified men there in the county that have been trappers and I think they can take care of

that very easily and within our own scope. I don't think they will have to go out of there to spend \$25,000 to get this taken care of.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In other words--

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: You say only \$5,000 - I understand it was \$25,000.

MR. LEE: \$25,000. I don't think we will have to go out and get the \$25,000. We have a man there that is already qualified.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, do both of you or either one of you gentlemen feel this is a sufficient amount to take care of your problem, the \$25,000, in view of the fact it is going to have to encompass Humboldt County also?

MR. BORDEN: If it is spent in that area, but it is not going to go through that area.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: This is the point. Now, Mr. Shannon, may I ask you what proportion of this \$25,000 do you assume at this particular time in your discretion will be expended in Trinity County? Can we be somewhat assured or how can you assure us that the trapper is going to stay there and for what length of time?

MR. SHANNON: I can't assure you on this because the Fish and Wildlife in handling such a contract did not want to make any commitments as to how long or in just what areas specifically the man would reside. That is why, or one of the reasons the negotiations on this thing were tied up for quite a little while. We ended up by saying that we wanted particular attention paid to these several counties which were interested in this, and they

agreed that they would do this.

Now, I couldn't say how long or how many man months would be expended in Trinity County as a result of this discussion, but they want to operate their program, the Fish and Wildlife Service, in relation to their total program and they told us that if they were bound by the Department of Fish and Game saying we had to have one man in Trinity County or two men in Trinity County, they couldn't work it in with their whole entire program where they move their men around in accordance with the populations of predators.

So in order to negotiate the contract we had to agree to that, but we asked them to pay particular attention to these counties.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: May I ask Mr. Shannon a question? Probably your wildlife man would be able to answer this. Isn't it true that in other states there are such things as controlled predator drives such as I have described?

MR. SHANNON: Ben, do you want to answer that?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Are you familiar with that type of drive?

MR. GLADING: As I understand Assemblyman Allen's question, he asked me are these drives effective, you mean as predatory animal control?

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Hasn't it been accomplished in other states such as Nebraska, Wyoming and various other states?

MR. GLADING: I am not too well acquainted with the successes

of them. I know they have been conducted. They have been conducted on crows. They have been conducted on jack rabbits, but I am not too well acquainted with the claimed success that the Department might hold for them.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: In other words, it is not an impossible thing to do, is it?

MR. GLADING: No, sir, it is not an impossible thing to do.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Under a controlled situation where you would have your people in the field, a reasonable control of these people is assured? I know it is more difficult, of course, to take a coyote sometimes but once in awhile you run across them and shoot them. It is probably easier to trap them, of course, than it would be to just go out and hunt for them and shoot them, but it can be done.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, may I ask you at this time what is your feeling on a possible appropriation for a permanent State employee for this area of Humboldt and Trinity to alleviate this problem for a short period of time and probably since Fish and Wildlife Service are spread over a large territory they could take care of it in the future if this immediate problem is taken care of?

MR. SHANNON: Well, Mrs. Davis, we were kind of in the middle this last session. On one hand they took predatory animal control people away from us and on the other hand they passed a resolution directing us to put more emphasis on it, put more money into it. They took the three lion hunters away from us and passed

a resolution that we should spend more money on it.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is true, but I didn't see you screaming too loud to keep the lion hunters in there. I was fighting to keep them in there. I am asking your feeling and what support you would give us if an appropriation would be forthcoming? Would you be in favor of it?

MR. SHANNON: Generally we are not in favor of increasing the predatory animal control program at this time because we don't think the money is going to bring adequate returns. If the Legislature appropriates money to put a man on, we will put him on. We don't advise it. We don't think you will get an adequate return for the money spent.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We are right back to where we started in the first place. Again I suggest to the County Board of Supervisors that you might take into consideration the employment of a county trapper to take care of this problem, and we will see where we go from there.

MR. BORDEN: Thank you very much and I think that concludes our testimony.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much. This concludes our agenda for today and we will recess until tomorrow morning at nine-thirty, and I want to thank everyone for being here and I hope that all of you gentlemen can come back again because I don't have the slightest idea whether there are going to be questions of you or not.

(Thereupon the hearing recessed until the next morning.)

WITNESSESTUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960Page

Walter Shannon, Director, State Department of Fish and Game -----	181
Stan Simidian, President, Hunting and Fishing Club of Central California-----	183
Charles Bohrmann, Representing Associated Sportsmen of California, Incorporated-----	227
Robert Vile, President, Ocean Fish Protection Association-----	291
Edmund Kohlhauf, Representing Golden Gate Sports Fishers-----	323
Carl O. Fisher, Representing Superior California Wildlife Federation-----	328
Burton Banzhaf, Representing Ukiah Rod & Gun Club-----	333 343
Jack Mitchell, Ukiah Rod & Gun Club-----	337
Jerry David, President, Southern Council of Conservation Clubs-----	357
John Gilchrist, Representing San Francisco Tyee Club-----	367
Cecil Phipps, Sportsman-----	373
Edward F. Bruce, President, California Wildlife Federation-----	384
---oOo---	
Letter from Del Norte Chamber of Commerce-----	394
Letter from Northern Counties Conservation Assn.-----	396
---oOo---	
Motion by Assemblyman Williamson re creation of Citizens' Advisory Committee on Big Game-----	319

---oOo---

Morning Recess-----	Page 226
Afternoon Session-----	Page 252
Afternoon Recess-----	Page 328

---oOo---

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960, 9:30 O'CLOCK, A.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We will proceed with the second day of the hearings considering the proposed accounts of the financial status of the Department now and in the future. I want to remind those people at the table that they are still under oath and I think Mr. Croker, you escaped me yesterday, so I would like to have you raise your right hand and take the oath.

(Thereupon Mr. Croker was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

I might say before we call on our first witness this morning, I think that probably there should be some questions asked due to a subject matter that we concluded our meeting on yesterday and that was the point of predatory control. It is possible that some people in the audience may have interpreted the \$25,000 that was quoted by you, Mr. Shannon, as earmarked for Trinity and Humboldt Counties, and I would like to have you thoroughly explain what boundary lines that will take into consideration as far as your cooperative program with the Fish and Wildlife Service as far as predatory control is concerned.

MR. SHANNON: The \$25,000 is to be given to the Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct a predatory animal control program in connection with their existing program and it is not specifically allotted to Trinity County or any other county. Now, in our discussions with Fish and Wildlife we asked that certain counties be considered for the expenditure of this money, particularly because

they were the ones that felt that they needed assistance in this program and we mentioned Trinity County, Humboldt County and I am not sure, there were two or three other counties, and these were for the most part the counties which appeared in relation to Senator Christensen's resolution and we felt that in connection with this contract that these counties should receive attention.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How many counties are involved? Is this statewide?

MR. SHANNON: This \$25,000 is statewide.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I want to make that clear, that it is statewide, that it isn't earmarked for any specific place, nor is anyone given a guarantee that any of that money or a certain proportion of that money will be spent in that area. Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. SHANNON: We can't guarantee that, but we certainly will try to see that the money is expended in those counties in the north there where they feel it is necessary.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: This \$25,000 you are requesting in this fiscal budget, correct?

MR. SHANNON: I believe it is already in the budget. It is a matter of getting the agreement signed and delivered so we can proceed and turn it over to the Fish and Wildlife and they can start out.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: So actually the contract has not been signed yet. It is being negotiated as far as the Fish and Wildlife Service is concerned?

MR. SHANNON: Most of the negotiation is through. It is now in the Department of Finance for their approval.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: But it has not been approved?

MR. SHANNON: Not by the State. It has been approved by the Department and tentatively by the United States Fish and Wildlife, so it is in the final stages of procedure.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Well, I think there needed to be a clarification on that because I don't want someone to leave these two day hearings and feel that I had achieved \$25,000 for Trinity County although it would be very nice, but that isn't the case. I understand that Mr. Stan Simidian, representing the Hunting and Fishing Improvement Club of Central California has to leave early, so if it is agreeable with Mr. Bohrmann who was the first witness today, we will proceed with Mr. Simidian. I might introduce a member of the Fish and Game Committee who was unable to be with us yesterday. To my right is Mr. Eugene Nisbet from San Bernardino County.

(Thereupon Mr. Simidian was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Will you be seated and proceed.

MR. SIMIDIAN: Madam Chairman and committee members and ladies and gentlemen, my name is Stan Simidian, President of the Hunting and Fishing Improvement Club of Central California. I wish to take this time to thank you, Madam Chairman and members, for permitting me to appear early. I returned home yesterday and found I wasn't supposed to be appearing here today. I called an

alternate and the alternate informed me I was to be my own alternate. Unfortunately he has my notes which he received yesterday afternoon but I will try to recall those from memory. Our organization represents approximately 1,000 members in Stanislaus County.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I interrupt you. Are you affiliated with the California Wildlife Federation?

MR. SIMIDIAN: No.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right.

MR. SIMIDIAN: We are in favor of the self supporting catchable trout program. When we say that we mean the money derived naturally from the trout stamp sales. I will go over these briefly and then, of course, I have some questions and possibly you have questions of me.

We also believe on the catchable trout program that much more emphasis should be given to habitat improvement with cutbacks in the catchable trout program in the future. Much consideration should be given to the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report which we all heard about yesterday.

On the pheasant policy, which I will jump to now and we will be back to the trout matter. We are in favor of cutbacks at this time, possibly a reduction of four cooperative areas. We are not in favor of maintaining two in the south and none in the central or northern part of the state.

Now, I know that is going to lead to a lot of, well, we do have to do this or we have to do that or we are cutting back. There are many other aspects of this that have to be considered.

for the future and I think we all agree, I am pretty sure the Department does, that we are in pretty rough shape as far as the pheasant situation looks in the future.

The availability of hunting grounds and so forth and so on is pretty rough. Now, before I ask any other questions that I had in mind, possibly you would want some explanation on why we are in favor of a catchable trout program at this time and why we believe in cutbacks in the future and I will try to explain it briefly.

We believe a better fishery as far as trout are concerned can be maintained by habitat improvement over a long period of time. Any of the people present here today that were on the catchable trout planting tour conducted by Mrs. Davis late this past year, I believe really had their eyes opened and I can't help but think that part of this cutback in the program that is taking place now possibly was due to some of those investigations.

I wish you could all see what we saw. It is really pathetic in some cases. Now, that is my interpretation of it. Others may have something else to say on the matter actually, and this is not the exception. I believe it is the rule that many of your resort owners throughout the country know well in advance of when your trout will be planted. They advertise this fact and you may say that is to be expected.

Well, that is true, but it was mentioned yesterday that fifty percent of our catchable trout are put in the bag by the sportsmen, although I believe the Booz, Allen and Hamilton findings

show something less, around thirty percent. Well, it must be considered that even if it is sixty or seventy percent, what percentage of the population are putting those in the bag?

There are many, many cases where people rush down, catch a limit, go home and rush back and catch another one. That is taking place all over the state. I know of one instance in Tuolumne County where the Fish and Game truck was in town I believe somewhere just before noon. Practically all the stores in town closed down and by the next morning there wasn't a catchable trout to be had where they were planted just outside the city limits.

Now, those aren't remote cases. They are very common things. All of that has to be taken into consideration.

We realize, of course, that Southern California is in need of some catchable trout program just like they need water, but we don't deny them that, but still we don't believe that we in this part of the state, Central and Northern California, should support such a program to any great extent. With everybody working toward what we believe might be the solution, a habitat improvement program, you will benefit in the long run. Maybe not over the first few years, but over a period of time you will benefit more greatly by that than you will by the catchable trout programs in existence today, although temporarily this has to be to satisfy some of the sportsmen.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee relative to Mr. Simidian's position on the catchable program? Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I didn't get the explanation about Southern California catching all these fish.

MR. SIMIDIAN: I didn't mean they caught all the fish. I meant to imply that they need a catchable trout program and that our outlook on this thing is that we believe in helping other sportsmen but we don't believe that any fantastic amount of sportsmen's dollars should be put into a program that is costing nearly two million dollars as it has in the past, where we derive very little benefit from it.

Actually it amounts to this. Many of the people in the audience today are trout fishermen and have been for years. I know I have been for over twenty years. I realize that the wild trout are becoming more and more scarce, but at this present time I can go into our Sierras along with hundreds of people from my community and we will have no trouble in taking a limit of trout.

Now, I know in the reports from the Department that only ten percent, take limits of wild trout. I don't believe so. I don't believe we should try to make sportsmen out of the public. That is what we are doing when we overemphasize this catchable trout program.

Mention was made yesterday of a stream alongside the road down south that hasn't a wild trout in it. Well, that is clearly understandable. I wouldn't expect any stream alongside the road with our population today and the angling public to contain very many wild trout.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Would you say it was best that the

Department plant these fish without advertising, plant them at night sometime when nobody is looking?

MR. SIMIDIAN: I understand the Department's explanation of that is that it is rather expensive. It can't be scheduled that way. Possibly they can explain that a little better than I can. Anything would help other than the way it is being done now.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well then, what you are actually saying, Mr. Simidian, even though you recognize that a catchable program is very important and necessary to the southern part of the state, but you still feel that proportionately most of the money is being expended for the catchable program which is very true, I think there was about sixty-seven and a half percent of the catchable fish planted in the southern area of the state according to the figures I have, and what you are asking for is that perhaps some of this money that is being utilized from that standpoint to be at least used for stream improvement to enhance wild trout?

MR. SIMIDIAN: We believe there is no question about it. We didn't investigate the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report as we should have, as many of the other organizations did not. I think we probably assumed that since the legislators asked for the report to be made that it would be analyzed by the legislators and we would be given a report.

I don't think the sportsmen thought it was going to be their job to analyze it. Now, that is the response I get on questions concerning the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report.

Now, they so state in there and the Department has admitted

they have used several recommendations from this report, so I can see that we have been benefited greatly by the report.

I think \$100,000 is probably a small price to pay when the Department will eventually probably gain much more than that money-wise in the long run.

The catchable trout program is explained in there, or I should say it is referred to as a stream habitat improvement program, and we believe that without any Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report.

Many, many sportsmen at least in my area do and in consulting with other sportsemen's groups they seem to feel the same-- that is, in this area. I am not speaking of any of the southern counties.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Mr. Simidian, we have been told in connection with other committees here and other programs of the State such as the water program that the future of the entire northern part of the state lies in the further development of recreation, principally fishing. This doesn't quite tie in, in my mind, with what you have been saying here. Apparently what you are saying is that the catchable trout program is great for the people down south under the assumption they are going to stay down south. If you are going to develop recreation in the northern part of the state, you are not going to be able to rely upon your wild trout program and you people should be as interested as anybody else in developing a catchable trout program.

MR. SIMIDIAN: We certainly are, Mr. Williamson. I am in

the sporting goods business and if you planted five million dollars worth of trout it would be to my advantage financially, but looking at it in an economical way, we believe that much more will be achieved, not immediately, but we believe sincerely that more will be achieved by habitat improvement at least for the cost over a period of time than the catchable trout program as it is today.

Now, in the development of these recreational areas, many of them undoubtedly will have to be stocked, but that is not what we consider a catchable trout program.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Well, do you have any idea what the stream pressure of the population of Southern California can do to a stream as was mentioned yesterday in connection with the Kern River?

MR. SIMIDIAN: I certainly do. I have seen it take place in Bridgeport where residents of Southern California at the opening of the trout season have been there very predominantly, much more than the Central or Northern California people. They have really put a lot of pressure, you might say, on Central California itself where naturally if they had more trout down south they wouldn't come as far north, but we are trying to look at this thing in a long, not a long range, but a better for everyone attitude in the future.

We have so much money to spend on our fish and game program and there are so many things that we believe need improvement. Naturally, I suppose that will go on as long as time, but to get an equal distribution naturally an overemphasis put on any project

could lead to a laxity in some other part of the Department.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: It would seem to me that you folks would be more interested than anybody else in developing this program. We know our population is going to increase in even greater ratio than it has in the past.

MR. SIMIDIAN: I said I believed in the Department's proposal to maintain the program as they now have it scheduled, but at the same time give serious consideration in the immediate future -- in other words, they would have to work it out where we believe something would be investigated which would be feasible on a habitat improvement program.

In other words, the Department is ours and it is yours and we believe the answer lies in habitat, not in catchable trout. I don't believe that we should cut the trout program at this present time, right this moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: I am sorry. I understood you to say it should be cut back.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee? If not, I have one, Mr. Simidian. What liaison has your association with the Department relative to their financial requests for their fiscal year relative to the things that we were interested in, to put into the Governor's budget which is actually paid by the license buyer?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Well, actually, none Madam Chairman. That is something that we have all been rather concerned with. We were happy to see that legislation was passed last year, but we were all

curious before that why we had never received any information. That was a prime subject with us, why haven't we got a cost accounting, and it preyed on our minds.

In fact that has caused many, many sportsmen, very many sportsmen throughout the state to doubt the Department.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Have you ever requested any information from the Department relative to the expenditures that they would be seeking before a legislative body in a coming fiscal year?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Not myself, but other organizations such as the old fishermen's club in our area which has been established much longer than our organization, has.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And what reply, do you know, did they receive?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Well, I am told they received none. They put it this way, "We got the run-around." Now, those were the words given to me. Now, what actually took place I couldn't say. I do know that we were all in the dark. We were awfully glad to see this legislation become law. We were all interested in it, and now through a cost accounting of the Department we can readily see where our dollars go.

It is something that we sorely needed in the past. I know we didn't receive too much cooperation. I can't say I received none because I asked for none.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask you relative to the figures that have been submitted to you by this committee, which are the Department of Fish and Game figures, which we obtained from the

Department of Finance, and the Department of Finance actually received these figures from the Fish and Game Department. Do you have any points of disagreement in any of the programs that are now under existence that you might like to comment on?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Yes, I do. I was coming to that. You are speaking now of the --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: The expenditures.

MR. SIMIDIAN: The expenditures such as the pheasant policy?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, or any other expenditure.

MR. SIMIDIAN: I would like to take that one next if I may. In the pheasant policy I might say that we believe that the future pheasant hunting lies in the small farms. Now, that may seem rather hard to understand, but it is very simple. We conducted a survey, not an extensive one, but a survey by having individuals of our organization talk with farmers who were not members, promising that their names would not be used. They asked the farmers why they have no pheasant population to speak of at all on their acreages when in the past, a few years ago, they had several.

And the answer generally was that, "Well, we got sick and tired of rearing pheasants for sportsmen." The simple answer is that it all amounts to this, that they in turn were out on the plow or out in the field and they killed the pheasants. One fellow made the statement and another said the same, that they had 80 acres and probably there were 25 or 30 birds on this acreage and they went out to shoot the first morning themselves and there were 15 or 20

or 30 sportsmen out there ahead of them or so called sportsmen.

Now, they are in favor -- this is in our area alone, but as I say we did make a brief survey. They are in favor of the Department planting these areas, planting the areas where they have natural habitat. The Department cannot create pheasant habitat. I believe we all know that.

That is something that is rather hard to do. It probably could be done but it is awfully hard to do. It could be done with the cooperation of a block of farmers where they would be paid a nominal fee to rear these pheasants, and an overabundance of pheasants does considerable crop damage. I think we all know that, but there are several that would be willing to try that whereby the Department will plant the birds and they will rear the birds and charge accordingly to the sportsmen.

It would be nothing out of the Department's pocket. It would be out of the sportsman's pocket. It would be his prerogative to pay or not to pay.

Now, the program they have now, it appears that much of the pheasant policy, and I can be wrong here -- I am not sure I understood a lot of the questions, but is to maintain our two Southern California co-op areas and do away with the ones in the Central and Northern part of California.

Now, very possibly -- is that correct, Mrs. Davis?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you like to ask that question of Mr. Shannon for clarification?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Yes, please.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Is that the case?

MR. SHANNON: That is not the Department's proposal. I think that was mentioned by another group. Our proposal is that we would cut down the number of game farms to two. One of these would be used to raise chicks to supply sportsmen's pens and other groups who have pens, that the cooperative area would still exist in the north, but would depend upon wild birds, and because the two southern cooperative areas depend entirely on planted pheasants, necessarily they would be eliminated unless the local people wanted to keep it up and raised the birds.

MR. SIMIDIAN: Yesterday some mention was made of the cooperation with sportsmen's clubs and we experienced this with a few organizations in our area and some just outside of our area. I understand it was with the agreement of the Department and the Department supplied the birds and the so-called sportsmen's organizations supplied the housing and the rearing of these pheasants and in turn, under the Department supervision they received 50 percent of those birds on open land or areas that are open to the public and the other 50 percent remain in their possession.

Now, before we go into the open land, I would like to say that right now there are other organizations, they call themselves sportsmen's groups, that are organizing with some enterprising individuals that are going to capitalize on this undoubtedly whereby their memberships are 15, 25, or 35 dollars a year. Now, they receive the fine money from the counties, which is partially the county's fault, but under this setup they are entitled to it. They

receive the birds from the Department. They organize this organization, this supposedly non-profit organization, and in many cases actually I guess they are, but they are strictly a social organization and they do nothing for the betterment of the sportsman. They let other organizations handle the legislative matters and the other matters while they enjoy a fine pheasant club.

I don't believe that that is any answer to our solution. I don't know how many of the representatives here today rear their own birds, or have their own rearing pens and rear pheasants for their members. I wish I knew. I would like to have them raise their hands at this time. Only one.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: San Diego.

MR. SIMIDIAN: Well, that is understandable, but this affords various groups, and they call themselves sportsmen, and they form private clubs. We have a club near Modesto where the membership is closed and has been for two years and others that claim that next year they will have no openings.

That is not right in our area, but we have got some near there too that claim their memberships, they are so swamped that they can't handle any more. They have 60 fellows and that is it because that is all their area will take care of as far as pheasant hunting is concerned.

They don't care whether their organization grows to a thousand or not. It makes no difference to them. They are not looking for the sportsman, so that part of the Department's program I think is wrong. There is not enough real active sportsmen's

groups to take advantage of it. Now, we call for the betterment of the sportsman as a whole.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee? Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I would like to hear from the Department after these witnesses testify in order to give the Department an opportunity --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We haven't precluded the Department from making any comment at any time. I just asked the committee first.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: If the Department would make known their views on these policies and programs that are presented.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, we will do that. Are there any other questions? Mr. Lunardi.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: Are you recommending that the organizations be licensed per capita like a fraternal organization, pay so much to the national fraternal organization?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Not necessarily, Mr. Lunardi.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: What do you recommend?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Our recommendations are simply this, that the Department before they issue any of these birds to be raised or reared for these organizations, that there be at least some investigation of the validity of the organization as a sportsmen's group and not just a dozen or two dozen or four dozen fellows banded together to form a pheasant club.

I mean that actually is of prime concern with organizations, neighboring organizations that see these things happen and they

naturally don't blame the Department for it. They have got many problems and probably thought they were doing the sportsmen a great turn, but in turn it creates a problem where the legitimate sportsmen think the Department are supporting those who are not so, and it throws a bad light upon the Department.

I don't offer remedies for all these things I am telling you. I am simply stating what we believe and we don't pretend to have the answers to them all. There is one other point I would like to mention and that has to do with our warm water fisheries.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Before you go into that, I might ask the Department, do you care to make any comments on the points that have been made here by Mr. Simidian relative to either the trout or pheasant program?

MR. SHANNON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Proceed.

MR. SHANNON: For the record, Mr. Simidian earlier stated that they were in favor generally of reducing the number of cooperative hunting areas from eight to two. I think he must have meant the game farms when he said cooperative hunting areas, did you not? You would be in favor of eliminating all the cooperative hunting areas in Central California?

MR. SIMIDIAN: No, I said we were not in favor of eliminating the eight. We are in favor maintaining four cooperative areas throughout California with at least two in Central and Northern California.

MR. SHANNON: By cooperative areas you are talking about

cooperative hunting areas?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Yes.

MR. SHANNON: We have thirteen cooperative hunting areas and I just wanted to find out exactly what he meant there because our cooperative hunting areas in Central California is one of our most popular programs and for the average sportsman it is the only chance he gets to hunt pheasants in most cases.

MR. SIMIDIAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How very true.

MR. SHANNON: I just wanted to be sure I understood what he meant. You would be in favor of reducing these to four?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Well, if a reduction is so necessary -- it was stated yesterday, and maybe I misinterpreted that, but it was stated yesterday that of these cooperative areas -- now I am talking about the cooperative areas in my locality such as Merced where the live plants are made. That will be discontinued. You are speaking of cooperative areas with wild birds or cooperative areas with plants?

MR. SHANNON: We are in favor of continuing the cooperative hunting areas in Central California but not planting domestically raised birds. In other words, we want to depend on the wild population.

MR. SIMIDIAN: We are in favor of maintaining four cooperative areas with planted birds, at least two to be in Central and Northern California. In other words, you have eight now and that would be a reduction of four.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: What you are saying, Mr. Simidian, is that in the retention of these co-op areas that you are interested in, you still want the artificially raised birds planted there?

MR. SIMIDIAN: The Department, we believe, realizes the importance of cooperation with the farmers in large blocks to propagate pheasants for the hunter. Now until that is maintained or until that is accomplished and maintained, why we face a very drastic situation as far as pheasant hunting goes. I know I was born and raised in an area, one of the finest in the state, for its size, the Oakdale area, and that is in a pathetic shape right now.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, what is your opinion, Mr. Simidian, relative to the reduction of the game farms to two, one at Yountville and one at Chino? Do you have any opposition to that?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Well, yes, naturally I assume this, that it would be rather expensive to transport birds from there to Central and Northern California and still maintain the areas here.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well then, don't you suppose that probably, and I will ask Mr. Shannon this question also after I ask it of you, don't you suppose that is the reason they are specifying that none of these artificially raised pheasants be planted on these other co-op areas such as in Central and Northern California probably due to the travel expense that would be involved?

MR. SIMIDIAN: That is exactly it, Madam Chairman. We don't believe --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is your feeling?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Now, Mr. Shannon, you have heard the question, what is your answer to that?

MR. SHANNON: As I understand your question, it would be that -- would you state it again Mrs. Davis to be sure?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes. Is your recommendation in any way based upon the elimination of the planted pheasants being placed on these co-op areas in Central and Northern California due to the cost of transportation that would be involved from Chino or Yountville game farms?

MR. SHANNON: No. It is more basic than that. In other words, as far as that particular question is concerned, we can haul pheasants cheaper than we can establish local game farms. If we wanted to raise pheasants and plant them as we do now, we would be in favor of consolidating the game farms and hauling the birds longer distances rather than establishing small game farms.

It is a more economical operation to consolidate and haul rather than have a bunch of small splinter units scattered throughout the state. Basically, the reason why we want to discontinue stocking birds in our cooperative areas and on other lands available to the public in Central California in the pheasant habitat is that the birds that we stock amounts to a relatively small percentage of the birds that are returned to the hunter.

In other words, the wild bird population furnishes at least 90 or more percent of the birds that are taken by the hunter during the season. We can provide good shooting based on wild birds alone and the pheasant population is sufficiently established

in California to do this. We have a big pheasant population. There may be cycles up and down as there was last year where there was a poor nesting season, but basically our pheasant population is in good shape and it will provide good hunting and we feel we should concentrate on providing access to those birds for the public.

Now, that is why we are in favor of cooperative hunting areas and we think it is a great program and Mr. Simidian stated that we should concentrate on better relationships with the farmer. Our cooperative hunting areas program is a very good cooperative measure with the farmer.

In other words, we guarantee him protection against depredation. We patrol the area and he opens it up for public access. It is a joint proposition for the benefit of the hunter and we have other programs in cooperation with the farmer and we offer advice as to how pheasant habitat can be improved, and it can be improved and we can do it, but most of the lands are private and we have to get the land owner to do this, but it certainly can be improved and we are working on that particular angle.

I would like to make some more comments on what Mr. Simidian has said, but if you would like to ask him some more questions I will wait until after you finish.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Simidian, do you have any comment to make on what Mr. Shannon just stated?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Yes, we believe to an extent that -- well, let's put it this way, that the cutback in the pheasant plant and the maintenance of the trout plant, they do not warrant it in

comparison to the people that take advantage of pheasant hunting and trout fishing.

Now, you have nearly a quarter of a million, I should say a half million or so pheasant hunters, I believe who will probably buy tags next year. You have three-quarters of a million trout fishermen. How much money is spent on the pheasant program and how much on the trout program?

I realize it is a much shorter season in the pheasant season and there is not the cooperation of the farmer. It is not as great where they don't take the youngsters pheasant hunting as much as they do in the family outing for trout fishing, but still Mr. Shannon stated that they are attempting to get better cooperation with the farmers.

We maintain that until they do, they should maintain some form of pheasant hunting which will be available to all. Now, I don't know whether Mr. Shannon has been in the field. I know, of course, he is in the field, but he doesn't mingle with the hunters probably as much as some of the others of us and I have been all up and down the state and been invited to hunt several places, and I wish I had had a recorder with me, but --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Probably be a good thing to take a recorder with you and then we would really get the facts.

MR. SIMIDIAN: I have one on order, Mrs. Davis.

MR. SHANNON: I might say, Mrs. Davis, I don't think I need a recording of that. I was out several times during the last pheasant season. I didn't tell anybody who I was and I think I

know what they are talking about. They are certainly in favor of the cooperative hunting areas and it furnishes them the land to hunt on which they otherwise wouldn't have.

Certainly, we always hear complaints. Nothing is perfect. We get our share. Some of them are good and we take action on those when we think they show signs of improvement and where we can improve the situation, we do take action. I might say that in relation to the catchable trout program --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Before we get off the pheasants, how many pheasant hunters do you think we have in the state?

MR. SIMIDIAN: We have approximately 200,000.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Two hundred thousand. Then under the program as you are recommending it to the Fish and Game Commission for their adoption, would I be correct in saying that a greater portion of the revenue that is going to be brought in from the wild pheasants is actually going to carry the load for the bird that is artificially raised and planted in Southern California? Would that be a true assumption?

MR. SHANNON: Well, according to our proposed policy, we would not be planting birds in Southern California. Are you talking about our proposed policy?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes.

MR. SHANNON: Under our proposed policy we would not be planting mature birds for "put and take" shooting anywhere in the state.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I realize that, but the sportsmen's

organizations you have given these chicks to will be.

MR. SHANNON: Yes, they will be.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Well, nevertheless, it is an artificially raised pheasant and isn't the wild pheasant then to a great extent as far as the license buyer is concerned, carrying the load for the artificially raised pheasant whether the Department does it or whether a private individual does it or an organization is going to plant that artificially raised pheasant on it?

MR. SHANNON: The revenue that would be obtained from the pheasant hunters would be used to raise these small chicks, but the cost would be relatively small compared to the present program. But the only reason that we want to continue this chick program is because a lot of groups have built pens and they have put quite a bit of money into these installations and generally they are good outfits, and the Department does check into these outfits before we give them chicks.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I don't mean to leave the impression I am expressing feelings one way or the other as far as whether this program is good in behalf of raising the chicks, but what I want to establish is as far as the sportsmen from Southern California, and many of them do as you know come to Northern California and Central California, are actually picking up the tab proportionately for the artificially raised pheasants. This is what I am saying and it seems to me, and here I do have an opinion, that with the cooperation of ranchers and certainly there needs to be a good program of public relations with the

ranchers -- if you could see the letters in my office from this point of view, it would startle you as to what some of the so-called sportsmen do to property when they get onto private land.

This is something that has to be nullified and probably could be with the cooperation of the Department with the ranchers to enhance the natural habitat for the pheasants.

MR. SHANNON: Well, as I spoke before, Mrs. Davis, our cooperative hunting area program is designed under the law specifically to protect the farmer against depredation and trespass and it does a lot of that and we patrol it. We also do all we can to cooperate with the farmer in increasing the quality of the habitat and the proposed pheasant policy that we have before the Commission which emphasizes cooperation with farmers to enhance habitat conditions.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How do you guarantee this farmer that no depredation or trespass will occur? Will you explain that a little bit to me?

MR. SHANNON: On our cooperative hunting area we enter into an agreement with the farmer that he will open his lands to the pheasant hunter.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: For a fee?

MR. SHANNON: No, free of charge, although according to the law there could be a fee of \$2 charged.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is right. Well, what do you offer to him that induces him to permit you to go in?

MR. SHANNON: Under the law we set up checking stations,

we check the hunters in and check the hunters out and establish quotas so they are not overcrowded. The hunter comes in, he shoots, he comes out and he is checked out.

We assign men to post the areas ahead of the season. They post the exterior boundaries as to where the hunters can hunt and where he can't hunt. We post the restricted areas, the closed areas, and then we assign men to patrol. We have a crew on each and they patrol this area constantly to prevent trespass and any kind of depredation in opening gates and leaving them open and tearing down signs.

We watch for all those things and generally it has been very successful.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Let me ask you one thing. This is one thing that has always interested me. As I leave Sacramento on my way home and take the back river road, I see a highly cultivated area and I understand it is a good hunting area for pheasant, and I see a sign which says, "Members only welcome." What is your feeling on that?

MR. SHANNON: I might point out, Mrs. Davis, and I think Mr. Simidian had two things in mind when he was talking here, that under an act of the Legislature, individuals can set up licensed pheasant clubs and these pheasant clubs operate under the law and they can have a closed membership. They operate under an act of the Legislature and regulations set by the Commission.

They have signs posted in many areas throughout the state. You will find where it says "Licensed pheasant club members only"

and that is legal and it is of concern to us because these are increasing in the best pheasant habitat, but nevertheless they are legal, and a person by applying for a license can operate one of these clubs.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee at this point? Mr. Simidian, do you want to continue?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Yes, we are not concerned with the private clubs or the \$300 a year or five months out of the year club. Those are of no consequence to us as far as we are concerned. Actually, Mr. Shannon, we don't believe -- you say you have cooperation with the farmers on the areas, the cooperative areas we have now. We don't believe that even begins to touch on farmer-hunter relations.

It is the large areas that are widely scattered. What we propose is smaller areas, much more frequent, and you have a personal contact. I realize it is quite an extensive program, but you have a personal contact with each area. This other is one here, one there, and our entire county is left out and I just defy you to come out there and travel a tenth of a mile without facing a "No Hunting" sign.

We have absolutely no farmer-hunter relations at all there. They are all bad the ones we do have. Now, on the cooperative areas on the return of the birds killed, I can say from my own experience and any of you that have hunted there will bear me out in this, that anyone that is properly informed on how to hunt a planted bird in a cooperative area will get birds as long as those birds have been planted.

Now, most of the fellows are at a loss when they go to these areas as to what to do except walk out in the field. There are a few little tricks and if they were informed of those, about walking the wind rows and dragging a stick along beside them very slowly, they don't even need a dog, and at certain times of the day this past season, if they realize and wait until 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon until the area is damper, if they had a dog, the dog would start pointing.

There are a few tricks that could be of help to some of these sportsmen and they would get a much higher kill, I am certain.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Pattee.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: I have shot all my life and I have never dragged a stick. Tell us about that.

MR. SIMIDIAN: On the wind rows in a rice field in this particular area, the levee is about that high and it is almost impossible to walk on top of the levee. So you walk along side of it. It is still -- the rice growth is still there on the levee. The other is cut and you have the gun in your left hand and a stick in your right hand dragging it through there. The planted birds are so tight that ten people can walk within a foot of those planted birds and I am sure the Department will bear me out here, and the birds won't move.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Why don't you go out and shoot chickens in a cage if you want to shoot like that?

MR. SIMIDIAN: The bird gets up naturally, and they shoot

it but for some people that is good sport. At other times you get on those areas and you have fine sport.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: You call that sport?

MR. SIMIDIAN: There are some times when it provides fine sport, not for myself. I am not speaking of myself now, I am speaking of the fellows. I have plenty of places to hunt, but we are speaking of the unattached sportsmen that do not.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: I don't see why we take them out of the cage. Why don't we let them into the cage and start shooting? We might as well leave them in the trap hatchery and let them catch them there.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee? Mr. Shannon, do you have any comment?

MR. SHANNON: Well, I would like to say that as far as that goes, wild birds will hold just as tight as planted birds. That is a condition of weather, moisture, wind and everything else, as far as pheasant hunting is concerned.

In relation to farmer-sportsman relationships, I certainly agree with Mr. Simidian, that there is a big field here to work to improve these relationships. However, I am going to toss the ball back to him and say the reason most of these lands are closed is not the result of the Department but of the actions of people who call themselves sportsmen who are not sportsmen, and this is a very small percentage, but the farmer has had so much trouble that he has had to close his lands.

Now, I think in these sportsmen's clubs that 99 percent

of the people there would never do the things they may be accused of, but there is a small percentage and they may not belong to a club, but it is a small percentage of hunters who go in there and cause the trouble and the farmer is obliged to close his lands.

That is what causes the land closing. I might say also if I may talk about trout for just a minute now --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, surely.

MR. SHANNON: In relation to the trout program we agree that we want to go into more habitat improvement, and I would like to point out that yesterday we spoke about our proposed program. We intend to hold the catchable trout program at somewhere around its present level. All our increases in the budget are in the nature of habitat improvement which involves chemical treatment and log-jam removal, barrier removal, pollution control, and so forth.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And how much money have you budgeted for that, all of these things being taken into consideration, Mr. Shannon?

MR. SHANNON: Well, I don't know whether we can itemize it, but as we said yesterday, we have \$81,000 in relation to habitat improvement and warm water reservoirs. We have in the nature of \$65,000 to improve Lake Tahoe for fisheries and as far as chemical treatment, that amounts to around \$35,000 for chemicals alone.

We have for barrier removal on San Lorenzo River, \$10,000, I believe, and on the Noyo, \$18,000 for habitat improvement.

For pollution control, that is a part of the water project section and the whole water project amounted, as I remember to \$265,000.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Let's go back to this \$81,000 figure. You are taking a lot of things into consideration there that you feel this \$81,000 will cover, and let's pinpoint as an example this Truckee investigation.

Wouldn't it be cheaper on a contractual basis for someone else to undertake that endeavor, or the University rather than you people where you have to come in and ask for the specific things that are required for you to even undertake this investigation?

MR. SHANNON: Are you talking about the Tahoe -- you said the Truckee, Mrs. Davis?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I meant Tahoe.

MR. SHANNON: Yes. Well, the Tahoe fishery study is a good study we believe and it was a result of resolutions that were passed both in the Senate and in the Assembly asking us to do this.

Mr. Lunardi carried one and I believe Mr. Cameron, Senator Cameron, carried another.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is true, Mr. Shannon, but my point is that that still doesn't preclude you. This is the point I asked you about Saturday. This doesn't preclude you from recommending an alternative proposal that would be less expensive. I mean, because we direct you people to do these things just like

we do the Department of Water Resources many times, wouldn't it be wise to consider contractual agreements with other agencies or some university to take care of this program for you even though you have to review it and it is your responsibility, but it would be actually cheaper.

This is the thing that has disturbed me a great deal as far as financing in your department is concerned because I don't want your department to grow like a creeping vine, and I know in my own heart that the license buyer in the state of California in future years is not going to be able to face this financial load.

This is what I say, why don't you offer those alternatives even though you have these resolutions and they are your responsibility?

MR. SHANNON: Well, we have investigated contracts. In fact we have a lot of contracts existing now. We have a kelp study under contract. We have a number of others. In relation to this particular program at Tahoe, after looking at it very carefully and how it could be done, we felt that we could best do it with our using some of our existing people and help in addition to some additional positions.

We have not precluded contract work at all. In fact, we have quite a few contracts.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Have you actually sought it?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, we have.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I mean in this case?

MR. SHANNON: We haven't pursued this on a contract basis, not on this particular one.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That was my understanding.

MR. SHANNON: If you would like to have us issue contracts for this, if you would so --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: It would be cheaper -- isn't that within your discretion as the Director of the Department of Fish and Game to do this in behalf of the license buyer?

MR. SHANNON: Our experience with contract work has generally shown that it is not any less expensive. We pay administrative costs and other costs involved in contract work.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, of course, the point I want to make, and of course we are not going to be argumentative about this, but you have not sought any possible alternative as far as whether or not it would be cheaper by contract to undertake this investigation in Tahoe or not?

MR. SHANNON: We will be glad to look into the contract part of this, Mrs. Davis.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I wish you would. Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask the Chair a question? Is the Chair advocating that all these research programs should be done by contract?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: No, definitely not, Mr. Thomas, and you are one that has always been quite disturbed about the Department making investigations for years and coming up with no conclusive answers, and my point is that if they can find an outside agency

under contract that will do work that will be satisfactory to the Department at less cost to the Department of Fish and Game, which is actually financed by the licensed buyer, I think it should be explored.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: What are they going to do with the staff? They have a big staff.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, that is something for you and me to decide upon when we act on their budget. Mr. Simidian.

MR. SIMIDIAN: There was probably another thing we felt that should be brought up and that is the statement made in the report issued by the Department of Fish and Game. I believe Mr. Shannon made this statement in paragraph (g), page 14, "With the increasing numbers of warm water reservoirs anticipated as a part of the implementation of the California Water Plan, as well as the existing obvious need to make existing warm waters more productive, we have developed a plan to step up warm water fisheries work.

"A part of this plan already is in operation. Recently we have introduced threadfin shad into Northern California waters, after its previous successful introduction and subsequent research in Southern California waters. In addition, we have introduced striped bass into Millerton Lake and the Colorado River and we brought walleyed pike into the state for Southern California waters. We are continuing our research as well as experiments to find ways of improving warm water fishing.

"We have no basis on which to estimate the approximate

numbers of anglers who seek warm water fish, but we recognize this area as of increasing importance."

I think it is pretty evident to everybody that the warm water fishery is one of our largest. You speak with people throughout the state and you will find that they do some form of warm water fishing.

Now, I know there has been some controversy about this \$81,000 set aside in the budget for warm water fisheries and I had part of that explained to me prior to the meeting today but I still wasn't satisfied. It seems to me that is just a pittance to the money that they need for warm water improvement.

That is actually an insult to the warm water fishermen-- \$81,000 to a fishery so large and enjoyed by so many where we have such expenditures in other parts of the Department.

I would like some explanation to take back to my membership on why we are only allocating or budgeting \$81,000 to such a large fishery.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, Mr. Simidian, were you given assurance this morning that this entire \$81,000 was going to be used for enhancement of warm water fisheries?

MR. SIMIDIAN: I was given the assurance that eight biologists will take most of that \$81,000 and a small portion of that balance to be used, or the balance I should say, is to be used for investigation of the various problems.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Pertaining to warm water fisheries.

MR. SIMIDIAN: To warm water fishery -- that would

naturally include some trout fishing. I was speaking specifically of your black bass and bluegill and so forth and so on.

Of course the other goes right along with it, but our black bass fishery has been neglected something terrible in our reservoirs, and I believe the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report will bear that out. There are two reservoirs in our area that need attention as far as an eradication program is concerned. I use that for an example.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: How much money do you spend, Walt, on stocking these reservoirs that he is talking about? \$81,000 would go out in salary, but there is a lot more money than that going into the deal.

MR. SHANNON: Yes, we have quite a warm water program in addition to this. That proposed program is pinpointed specifically at reservoirs that are not now producing what they should. We have quite a warm water program already going. We have a staff at headquarters and regional people who devote a lot of time to improving warm water fishing, so that this isn't all of it.

This is a proposed addition for the next fiscal year which is pinpointed specifically to improve the conditions in these reservoirs which are not now producing what they should be.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: I think that is the answer to his question.

MR. SHANNON: That is right. We would have a number of biologists and only so much money for investigation. We have to

have people to do this. That is the only way we can do it. One of the problems that we have faced in the past is because of our heavy load on water projects and we are asking additional positions there because we have had to take men off existing programs such as warm water programs, trout programs, management programs and in the fisheries field, and put them on water projects because we had deadlines to meet in relation to water development.

We had to pull these people off. Now, with additional positions in the water project section, we can put more emphasis on warm water fisheries and fish management.

MR. SIMIDIAN: I fully understood that and we were all aware that they have a much larger warm water program, that the expansion of that program was a mere \$81,000 and consisted of eight biologists. I don't believe, I could be wrong, but I believe the poisoning of our reservoirs and so forth has been rather lax in the past.

At least the experiences we have had with it and the people that we have talked to would indicate that. Now, of course there have been differences with our organization and the Department on the matter of forage, which I won't go into now. I see that the controversial thing has been omitted from the warm water fishery reports so I am very happy for that, Mr. Shannon, and we believe that more emphasis should be put on the warm water fishery.

I guess you can sum it up about like that. I know it was discussed yesterday. Some of the Assemblymen and the members

of the committee felt the same way. That is what we simply feel, that more emphasis should be put on it because actually the way this is worded we have no basis on which to estimate the approximate number of anglers who seek warm water fish, but we recognize this area as of increasing importance.

It is very much so. It is increasing by leaps and bounds and unless we keep up with it, you are going to get a lot of discouraged, disappointed people, and you want your license sales up, so let's attempt to improve and make improvements where they are needed.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Now, Mr. Simidian, do you have any other comments you want to make other than covering the subject of trout and pheasants?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Yes, I do. I have one concluding statement here. I would like to have this defined for not only our organization but for myself. What is this money that is allocated for the conservation education department? What is it? Is that public relations or is it conservation or how is it spent and so forth and so on?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, probably we should ask Mr. Calkins that question. Mr. Calkins, would you like to answer that?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, Madam Chairman. In the 1959-60 fiscal year budget, there is a total of \$216,749 budgeted. Of that salaries and wages are for \$61,657. Those positions include a headquarters staff, including my salary, a hunter-safety

training coordinator and an information officer for Region III, San Francisco, an information officer in Los Angeles, Region V, and stenographic assistance.

The second area of expenditure is for printing. This makes up about half of the total expenditure and is broken into three general areas of types of publications.

The detail on that is attached to the report which Mr. Shannon gave yesterday. It is broken down there in relation to individual publications which we produce and distribute. We also provide service to the press and to authors and for pictures and so on relating to fish and wildlife conservation in California.

We have a visual aid program, principally motion pictures which Mr. Shannon touched on yesterday, for an expenditure of \$23,000 this fiscal year. Those are generally the areas of fiscal operation.

We also maintain extensive liaison through the Department of Education, also with local school districts, conservation groups such as the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, sportmens organizations, who are interested in the field of conservation and we endeavor to provide them with information on it and assist them in their projects relating to conservation education.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Simidian, or do you have any additional questions?

MR. SIMIDIAN: I don't know if you want to go into this-- the printing matter, the expense involved. If you want to skip

that, we will.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is up to you. If you are interested in it and have some questions on the printing matter, we will go into it.

MR. SIMIDIAN: I don't like to take so much time when there are so many others to be heard. That was the only thought.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask a question? You print the rules and regulations every year, don't you, and that is about \$50,000 I see in your budget.

MR. CALKINS: Yes, Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: That is all distributed throughout California?

MR. CALKINS: Yes. I didn't touch on any individual publications. This is the new 1960 regulations.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I received a copy of that.

MR. CALKINS: We print 1,150,000 copies of this publication.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: That would all go into the printing cost. May I ask the sportsman -- don't you think that is helpful to the people?

MR. SIMIDIAN: In many ways, no. In many, many ways no. Would you care to have me answer that?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I get information out of the bulletin and I get copies of the rules and regulations and when people in my district call my office I give them a copy of the rules and regulations on hunting.

MR. SIMIDIAN: Mr. Thomas, may I answer that?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Yes.

MR. SIMIDIAN: One of the reasons we feel it is exorbitant, and there are several of us such as license dealers who throw away countless pounds of literature sent to us. One thing the license agents could be requested to do is ask for regulations so they don't get loaded with an extra 150 pounds which you have to carry out in the back and dump in the garbage can.

And I have left mine in my store as I have thought this might be brought up. Mine are there. I haven't touched them.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Do you get 150 pounds from the Department?

MR. SIMIDIAN: That is what has accumulated from the previous owner and myself.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Do you mean to say they send you 150 pounds a year?

MR. SIMIDIAN: I would say there is that much accumulated from the previous owner and myself.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Over how many years?

MR. SIMIDIAN: I don't suppose they are over two years old. It is fantastic to believe the amount of literature you receive. We agree literature is a necessary thing, but still the point I am trying to bring out is that we are lacking in personal contact with the sportsmen's organizations. I mean you can send me a folder and tell me to be sure to have an either-sex deer hunt. I can read that and state the reasons and the sportsmen

won't accept it. If you send a man to explain it to the sportsmen instead of spending thousands of dollars trying to print it, you will put over your point. Printing does very little good.

That has been proven in the past. I am not complaining that they are way out of line on it, but I mean there can be some restrictions there -- I mean some arrangement can be made, \$10,000 or \$5,000 saved here is that much more to go into the propagation of fish and game.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: How about these sportsmens services, \$42,000?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think probably Mr. Calkins will have to answer that.

MR. CALKINS: This includes, Mr. Thomas -- I will take them by publication. That is the only way I can break it down.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I am not talking about rules and regulations. I am talking about sportsmens services.

MR. CALKINS: Yes. We publish such things as law enforcement and conservation aids, for instance items such as our litterbug pamphlet and posters that we put out this year, items such as the Stop, Look and Live, or hunter safety pamphlet in which we are trying to promote better relations between the Department and the land owners.

In the item also is monthly ~~Outdoor~~ California or the monthly publication on which we spend approximately \$14,000 a year. I am just taking the principal items here. We have a series of small publications featuring the principal species of

the state, one of which is the trout of California, another new one is "Insure Fishes" by John Fitch in which we try to give a comprehensive identification and discussion of problems relating to these various species for use principally by leaders in the conservation field and in the classroom.

We have been quite successful in getting local schools to purchase copies of that as supplemental textbook material.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Do all sports organizations get copies, too?

MR. CALKINS: Of Outdoor California, we send that to the president and secretary of each sports organization and we also send a copy to each licensed agent and to each hunter-safety training instructor and to each personnel of the Department. That is on Outdoor California.

We also have a series of maps known as anglers guides which are confined to those areas of the state particularly in the high altitudes where we have trout fisheries which we consider underharvested. By this means we endeavor to attract sportsmen to high country areas, hard of access, to take advantage of those resources, thus relieving our heavier fished areas of some of that pressure. We have no developed guides into the more popular areas because we have endeavored to avoid entering the Chamber of Commerce or private publications field in this area.

However, this particular series we feel is aimed at a specific increased use of a resource not being used.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Don't you think the sportsmen

are benefitting by that program?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Probably to a certain extent, but we believe it is exaggerated, Mr. Thomas. There are maps available, various maps, some that are taken advantage of, some that aren't of every county. It is all nice to have, but there has to be a cutback someplace along the line. That is something they can do without. I mean it would be fine to supply all the sportsmen with everything they need, but that is something they can do without to a certain extent.

I mean I don't say cut it out, but it should be cut back. You have pamphlets on everything you can name. I mean visit the Department office and help yourself.

MR. CALKINS: Might I comment on one phase of Mr. Simidian's statement? Stan and I happen to be from the same home town. We are pretty good friends actually, although it may not sound that way. I would like to comment that one of the problems we do have particularly with these publications, the regulation publications, which also include the waterfowl management area regulations, we endeavor to place those in the hands of the licensed agents, one of these for each license he sells during a year.

We distribute these on the basis of the previous year's sales both in hunting and in angling. Now, of course, we can't tell the license agent, "You shall issue one of these to everybody that buys a license," but this is the basis on which we endeavor to operate. We request they make these available to each license

buyer so that person will have the regulations in his hand.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: May I ask Mr. Simidian a question? Mr. Simidian, when you sell licenses do you go out and get that 150 pound pile you have out there and hand them one of these?

MR. SIMIDIAN: Those are old and expired.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: When the new ones come in, do you see that each licensee gets one of those?

MR. SIMIDIAN: I will have them available. I will make note to the Department if I become overstocked to please not send me any more.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee? Senator, do you have a question?

SENATOR ERHART: No.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Does that complete your presentation?

MR. SIMIDIAN: There is one more thing, but I am not going to go into it. You were nice enough to allow me this early time and I wish to thank you and the committee members and the Fish and Game Department and all concerned.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think we will take a ten minute break here and give the reporter a little rest.

(Thereupon the morning recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Our next witness will be Mr. Charlie Bohrmann and we want you to take all the time that is necessary, Mr. Bohrmann, but we are going to have to recess for lunch at 12:00 o'clock, but don't let that rush you along in any way.

(Thereupon Mr. Bohrmann was duly and regularly sworn

by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Please be seated and proceed.

MR. BOHRMANN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. It seems to me that I almost got off to a left handed start.

Madam Chairman, I regret very much that I was unable to have this presentation for the Associated Sportsmen mimeographed as I would have liked to have had it. I have three additional copies besides giving a copy to the Vice Chairman and if any of the members of your committee would care to follow through here and check the items on which they care to question me, the paragraphs are all numbered and I have tried to set it up in an intelligent manner.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Sergeant at Arms, will you pick up the copies?

MR. BOHRMANN: Madam Chairman and members of the Interim Committee on Fish and Game, my name is Charles Borhmann. I live at 1017 Vermont Street in Gridley. I am a retired state employee from the Division of Highways. I am authorized to represent the Associated Sportsmen of California. During the 26 years I served the Division of Highways, about 10 years were spent on day labor construction jobs where I was responsible for the cost data of the work.

2. The Associated Sportsmen of California, Incorporated, demonstrated their interest in the purpose of this committee meeting when you were invited to attend our council meeting at Lodi on December 20, 1959, and you were recalled to the floor

several times for further information.

3. You heard the council of the Associated Sportsmen of California go on record at that meeting as supporting the contention that all so-called "put and take planting" programs must be on a pay as we go basis. By that we obviously mean that the total cost of each of these programs must remain within the sums provided by the specific license monies earmarked for these programs.

4. For the sake of ready reference and understanding of these ASC contentions, I have compiled for the ASC a recapitulation of the Department of Fish and Game expenditures sent out with your letter of December, 1959, which will serve as a basis of what constitutes actual costs.

Perhaps I should qualify it and say what we believe constitutes actual costs.

5. Besides the information given by you, there is also the cost distribution presented in Outdoor California some years ago. This informed us that about one-third of every dollar deposited into our fish and game preservation fund goes for patrol, law enforcement.

6. It then becomes obvious that for every dollar of fish and game funds spent, we must deduct 20 cents for general overhead and retirement, as per this distribution I gave you, and 30 cents for patrol, because these two functions consume one-half of our expenditures.

7. The ASC did recommend to the Legislature a trout

stamp to finance the catchable trout program. The Legislature actually provided two angling stamps. So today we have an angling license consisting of three parts:

a. The basic \$3 license which entitles the holder to angle in the ocean and to take frogs.

b. The first additional stamp which entitles the holder to angle in inland waters for warm water fish and anadromous fish.

c. The second additional stamp which entitles the holder to take all fish in this state, including native and catchable trout.

8. Since the stamps issued for use under (b) and (c) are identical, it is now impossible to determine accurately the additional license income provided by the Legislature for warm water and anadromous fish, and the additional income provided for the catchable trout program.

9. It is therefore respectfully recommended that your committee give thought to legislation needed to provide two different stamps, one type for item 7(b), which is the inland fishery and anadromous stamp, and another type for item 7(c), the so-called trout stamp. Then after deducting the fixed charges shown in paragraph 6, we will know how much additional money is available for each of these separate functions for which the Legislature provided special funds, and expenditures then can be kept within such income.

10. It is your information that the estimated revenue for the raised trout program (catchable) was \$733,048. Then,

according to paragraph 6 above, there remains only \$366,524 after deducting 50 percent for overhead, retirement and patrol.

11. There appears to be only two basic justifications for planting catchables:

(a) To provide a limited artificial trout fishery in the water short portion of this state where stream conditions cannot provide wild trout.

(b) To provide a definitely limited artificial trout fishery in the vicinity of densely populated urban area, like Lake Merced, San Francisco.

12. We believe that planting catchable trout into the streams of the water abundant portion of California is not in the interest of an abundant trout fishery. In these streams, dollars which are spent to better the wild trout fishery will produce more and better trout over a longer period of time, than the same money spent on catchable trout plantings, which are known to be short-lived.

13. In fact, it is deemed that planting catchables in the water abundant portion of California is actually state competition with private enterprise trout farms.

14. Furthermore, we believe that it must remain the primary function of our Department of Fish and Game to provide needed habitat betterment to increase our fisheries by natural propagation, excepting perhaps anadromous fishes blocked by dams. In the case of trout we recommend, but do not limit to, rough fish control, fish food studies and enhancement, stream flow

maintenance storage of water, artificial spawning areas, and so forth.

15. When we realize that recently our Director of the Department of Fish and Game told us that there are about 26,000 miles of "fishable streams" in California, and if we deduct therefrom say 6,000 miles as warm water streams and sloughs, that will leave us about 20,000 miles of streams where natural propagation of trout can be enhanced.

16. California's fish and game program was published in 1950. On page 41, Dr. Albert Hazzard stated: "It would seem good common sense to find out more about the source of 88 percent of the fisherman's catch. If the production of nature could be stepped up only 12 percent it would equal the total hatchery production of that year (1950). Considering the vast improvements in agricultural production, due almost solely to research, such a goal does not seem out of reason." California paid for that expert opinion, but we do not appear to be utilizing it in our 20,000 miles of trout streams today.

17. To date practically nothing has been done to enhance and better the natural propagation in these 20,000 miles of trout streams, except the treatment of the Russian River and some smaller stream. As early as July, 1955, the ASC directed Resolution ASC No. 55-23 to the Department of Fish and Game asking for study why wild hatched trout do not survive in streams which are now predominantly populated with rough fish. In November, 1956, Resolution ASC No. 57-11 asked for rough fish

control in the Feather River. Due to the lack of Department action both of these resolutions were restated at the September, 1959, convention of the ASC, because we believe that more permanent benefit will result from habitat improvement, than will result from dumping short lived catchable trout into them.

18. These resolutions are based upon a study made by Taft and Murphy of the Department of Fish and Game and published in California Fish and Game (quarterly), Volume 36, issue of April, 1950. I here would like to read into the record some pertinent excerpts from this article. On page 147 we are told that the squawfish lives with the black bass and catfish at the lower elevations and at middle elevations with the trout, and many of California's streams have become warm through lower summer flows and reduce stream sidecover. This change has been caused by erosion, diversion, heavy flooding, and fire. As the consequence of the changed physical conditions which now favor them, squawfish and other rough fish have displaced trout in many stretches of such streams, though without competition trout would survive in these stream sections.

And it is on this basis, on this statement principally that we base our request for the rough fish control in the food rich low elevation streams.

There is also another statement here, "The migratory behavior of the squawfish has led to the suggestion that their numbers in a stream could be reduced by constructing a barrier to upstream migration, a barrier that would stop the squawfish

but allow migrating trout and steelhead to pass. Several specific proposals have been advanced by various biologists, and at least one experimental barrier will no doubt be constructed."

To date -- this was published in 1950 -- and to date I have no knowledge of any such barrier, artificial barrier being constructed. To demonstrate the predatory aspect of these squawfish which are native members of the carp family in our streams, "In Cultus Lake, B.C., the squawfish was found to be an important predator. They found that young red salmon up to a year of age are the most important food of squawfish more than 4.5 inches long, except during the period from May to September." After they controlled the squawfish in Cultus Lake, this increased the survival of red salmon from planted fry to downstream migrations by three and one-tenths times. In other words, where only one used to go down before, four downstream migrants went downstream after the squawfish were controlled. We know we cannot eradicate the squawfish because subsurface springs in our streams provide shelter for them during this treatment process and it is acknowledged that they cannot be eradicated, but they can be controlled and once they are controlled we may find effective means of keeping them under control in order to derive the benefits which have been demonstrated here by these other people.

The data for the squawfish in the Sacramento and Columbia strongly suggests that they compete for food with trout and prey on their young. A more subtle realm of competition is for space. All organisms require "living room" and it is apparent that a

stream choked with squawfish, which occupy much of the same niche as trout, does not offer much "living room" for trout.

Therefore, on that basis, whereas a coyote or a panther is simply a simple predator destroying game for food, the squawfish does the same thing to the trout. He eats the young trout, but he also eats the food that the trout must have in this stream and he competes with him for living space and therefore he is a far more dangerous threat. He is a triple threat instead of a single threat.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May we interrupt you at this point? I have a question, Mr. Bohrmann, and that is what you are saying is that you are interested in a greater emphasis on the elimination of the squawfish? You feel that that is very important?

MR. BOHRMANN: Yes, Ma'am. May I elaborate on that a little further and give you the opportunity to see where that can be done? I was just looking for my place here. I am sorry.

19. There is further support for rough fish control in trout waters in the Sports Fishing Institute Bulletin No. 97 dated December, 1959. On page 2 we read: "Three months ago the Back Fork of Elk River in West Virginia contained tons of trash fish and a few trout. Today, according to biologist Richard Wahl, the river contains about two and a half tons of trout and almost no rough fish." The article further states the river was treated for removal of all fish last September and two weeks later was planted with 83,000 trout fingerlings. Without rough fish competition these trout should range from six to ten inches long

next April. The entire cost of the rehabilitation, including labor, materials, supplies, transportation and fish for restocking only cost \$4,000. Had they stocked 86,000 catchable trout next spring, they would have cost \$20,000. In other words, you are receiving a permanent benefit, or we appear to be receiving a permanent benefit, a more permanent benefit for one-fifth of the expenditure of money when the streams are treated because I really believe that our Department of Fish and Game is efficient enough that they can do as good and as cheap a job as was done in Virginia.

20. While the above ASC resolutions only refer to the Feather River, this rough fish control applies to many hundreds of miles of food rich low and mid elevation streams in California, which today are principally dominated by rough fish. To list some of these streams for the records, I submit: the Upper Sacramento River, McCloud River, Pit River, Squaw Creek, Cow Creek, Clear Creek, Tomes Creek, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Stony Creek, Chico Creek, Butte Creek, the Feather River, Lower Sacramento River, Yuba River, Bear River, Cache Creek, Putah Creek, American River, Cosumnes River, Mokelumne, Calaveras, Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced Rivers and others further south, as well as probably some of the coastal streams in addition to the Russian River.

21. When Mrs. Davis' bill to close streams after planting was heard, the chief of the inland fisheries branch stated that this bill is proposed by resort owners who demand these plantings of catchable trout. It is respectfully submitted to this committee, that the trout anglers pay for these catchable

trout. That if catchable plantings are terminated in the water abundant portion of this state, these resort owners can set up their own private enterprise artificial fishing and also derive a profit from such private enterprise, when the state ceases to compete by planting catchables.

I overheard Mr. Shannon make a statement awhile ago about habitat improvement which is budgeted for this coming year and as far as I understood it, this applies principally to our anadromous trout, the steelhead trout, and not to the native trout which require the \$5 stamp. With the exception of Lake Tahoe, I heard of no proposal which affects the native trout to which I am referring in this presentation. Now, Mrs. Davis, that terminates my presentation on the catchable trout program. I thought perhaps you might prefer to open questioning on that before we go on to the salmon and steelhead trout.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by the legislative committee?

SENATOR ERHART: There is one correction I think that should be made on page 1, item 7, when you get down to (a).

MR. BOHRMANN: Yes, sir.

SENATOR ERHART: As long as you have included frogs, you should include clams and abalone.

MR. BOHRMANN: Well, it entitles the holder to angle in the ocean and I perhaps should have said take other mollusks and crustaceans, but those are principally ocean creatures, aren't they? I state that the \$3 license entitles you to angle in the

ocean. I should have said to take ocean resources -- that would have been a more accurate statement, and I would like to go on record as correcting it as such.

SENATOR ERHART: Could I ask Mr. Shannon this question? There is some doubt raised in regard to the Salton Sea. Some sportsmen are under the impression there was a ruling of the Department you could fish with a \$3 license in Salton Sea. Is that the case or is that not the case?

MR. SHANNON: That is an inland fishery and would require the \$4 license as I see it. Although it is salt water, it is not a part of the ocean as defined by law and administrative decisions.

SENATOR ERHART: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, may I ask you, Mr. Bohrmann, what is the policy, or does the Associated Sportsmen agree with the so-called recommendation that is being made to the Fish and Game Commission on the trout program?

MR. BOHRMANN: The Associated Sportsmen did support the proposed recommendations to the Fish and Game Commission and the resolution that was passed by the California Wildlife Federation on the catchable trout program was definitely supported by the Associated Sportsmen.

In fact, it was written by the representative of the Associated Sportsmen, but we did in that have the mental reservation that we feel that every license dollar must pay its pro rata of overhead and other fixed charges or else the rest of the other

programs are going to have to accept an increase of these fixed charges.

In other words, if we set up \$1,000 for any specific program -- that is why this recapitulation was made, was to demonstrate it, I have done a lot of distributing and therefore we consider that the cost of the Commission, the Director, the Department staff operations and the branch operations and the employees retirement should all be lumped into the grand total of \$1,938,805 which constitutes 20.19 percent of the total money spent by the Department and on that premise we must pick 20 cents off every dollar they spend, which reduces, of course, the cost of the program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions by members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: I would like to hear some comments from Mr. Shannon or Mr. Calhoun on this.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: Thank you. Without going into a long discussion and detailed discussion on the cost that Charlie has set forth here, of course these expenditures are taken pretty much out of the budget. However, I might say that we don't agree with his allocation of costs, particularly as to overhead and some other ways that he has arrived at these other totals.

We don't think that they have been put in the proper classifications. Without going into a detailed discussion, and we can discuss those I think with Charlie and arrive at some

understanding as to how he feels it should be done and how we are doing it -- I would like to have Dr. Calhoun -- we only call him Doctor in a committee meeting like this, but sometimes he should have advantage of that title I think. I would like to have him talk a little bit about rough fish control in streams.

Basically we don't disagree that we should do everything we can to control rough fish. However, this is a complex and difficult problem. I would like to have him talk just a little bit on it.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, Dr. Calhoun.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Madam Chairman, if it is the same Calhoun I know, according to Crocker and myself he can't catch catfish like Croker can.

MR. CALHOUN: My recollection is that you didn't catch very much that day either, Mr. Allen.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: I caught all that was caught, three.

MR. CALHOUN: Madam Chairman and members of the committee, we have agreed for some time with the ASC on the desirability of more attention to the type of water Charlie described in the low-land areas where the rough fish are indeed a problem and where if appropriate methods can be found it may well be possible at reasonable expense to improve the populations of game fish.

However, this is in an area I think where it will be apparent from some of the things Mr. Bohrmann said where we do not have established methods, we do not know how to do this effectively now, and at the present time the problem is one of finding out how

this may be done.

Mr. Bohrmann mentioned the possibility of barriers. That is one thing that could be tested. There is a growing tendency to look on chemical treatment of streams as an answer. That may be the answer, it may not be. There has been relatively little evaluation done on the results of the rough fish control on streams. More needs to be learned about it.

There is a possibility of more appropriate kinds of fish. Perhaps a combination of chemical treatment and the introduction of some new animal, the possibility of the European grayling has been mentioned which lives in this type of water in Europe. Our grayling is a very cold water fish. Apparently the European grayling has different requirements.

The Department at the present time is about half way through drafting a proposed project so that we can all then take a look at it and consider spelling out objectives of a study of this sort, pointing out what we think you would need in the way of personnel in a budget. I think it is premature to discuss it in detail until we have completed this study. We will have that in a few weeks.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. DeLotto.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: I would like to ask the last speaker a question regarding rough fish. Does your study include a classification of all the different types of fish that are actually rough fish in the context of what I am talking about.

MR. CALHOUN: I don't believe I understand your question.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: Can you tell me from your study what fish will be classified as rough fish?

MR. CALHOUN: Well, in relating this directly to Mr. Bohrmann's testimony, in the types of waters that he is dealing with, that is the low elevation streams circling the Central Valley, the squawfish and the hardhead are the two primary animals that we believe are causing the trouble.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: How about the hitch minnow?

MR. CALHOUN: It is not a problem in that type of water. It is a problem in sloughs.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: The reason I am asking the question, Madam Chairman, I am not a fisherman and I sit here trying to arbitrate some of these particular questions and I think that fact is going to have to decide it and not opinion in this business.

In the last day and a half we have been getting opinions. I feel there ought to be facts. The first person who has really nailed some things on the line is the present speaker where he points out some certain things that may be the basis for fact or a point of question, but at least he is saying something specific, and I am hoping that as we get more testimony that we will at least talk about something that is agreed upon by biological standards.

It is true that a squawfish is a rough fish and that it does eat trout and so on, and this is the kind of thing I am looking for and I am waiting to hear more.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I have been waiting also. Will you continue, Mr. Bohrmann?

MR. BOHRMANN: Madam Chairman, for the record --

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: I would like to ask Dr. Calhoun if he is familiar with these particular projects that Mr. Bohrmann has referred to here in connection with the control of rough fish?

MR. CALHOUN: Yes, sir, I am. There tends to be an over-optimism developed in this thing when it is in its preliminary stages. This experiment Mr. Bohrmann described in Virginia has just been completed. They now report that they have chemically treated the river, which I don't question.

They report that they have planted 86,000 fingerling trout, which I don't question. They say they are going to catch 86,000 catchable trout, which I do question. The point I am trying to make is this, it is premature at this time to say that chemical treatment of these streams is going to be the best answer. It may well be.

But what we need is a project which will clarify and get the facts that Mr. DeLotto is referring to.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: In other words, this project is so recent there is no way of knowing at this time how permanent the results are going to be or exactly what --

MR. CALHOUN: There is a wealth of experience to indicate that it will not be permanent and that in general when you chemically treat a stream it will be reinfested with rough fish in two or three years. However, in some streams that may prove

to be economic and it may be the way to do it, but you had better know that before you spend a lot of money on a big program.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMS: Let me ask one other question. When we speak of habitat improvement, are we only talking about control of rough fish, or are we talking about something else, too?

MR. CALHOUN: There again, you get into a question of definitions. I think it has been apparent that different people have different definitions of habitat improvement who have talked to this committee. There are two general types of habitat improvement. One type involves a physical change in the environment. It includes barrier removal, providing shelter, providing spawning areas, putting dams in which will raise the lake and make it bigger or perhaps improve the stream flow below a dam.

Then there is a big field of biological work where you manipulate the kind of animals in the reservoirs or streams which are part of some other animal's habitat, and by providing better food or controlling predators, you end up with more of the kind of fish, the kind and size you want for the angler.

In general this biological approach appears to have more prominence in more places. Usually we find in practice that when we seek means of physically improving habitat in California, where you can do it, it is very good, but the opportunities are limited.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: So therefore the direction would seem to tend towards the business of control of the animal life?

MR. CALHOUN: Yes, sir, that is the most promising for a

large scale program and it is still in the inception stage and the methods are not developed.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Any thought of removing brush for the convenience of the fishermen?

MR. CALHOUN: That has been advocated, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Dr. Calhoun, certainly we have been aware and I am sure you have that the problem exists as far as rough fish is concerned in the state of California before today, is that correct.

MR. CALHOUN: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: When did you actually become interested in making this investigation of the study that you are talking about which will take more staff in the budget?

MR. CALHOUN: Mrs. Davis, we have been discussing it for a number of years.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How many years, would you say?

MR. CALHOUN: To date -- I would refer to Mr. Bohrmann's testimony.

MR. BOHRMANN: 1955.

MR. CALHOUN: In their resolution in 1955.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How many biologists do you have working on this proposal and this study right at the present time under you?

MR. CALHOUN: None.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Absolutely none?

MR. CALHOUN: I have one man now who is working in such time as he can make available drafting a proposal which would in

fact be a project plan.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: This is something, in other words, you are talking about doing in the future?

MR. CALHOUN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And we have been constantly expanding our catchable trout program in the state of California in view of the fact of the tremendous cost to the license buyer, and I am very concerned here today relative to the unattached license buyer. There are many of them and I am just wondering where do they come into this picture and where is their protection, and this is truly my real concern, and I am just wondering if in view of this and the terrific cost involved in the catchable program, and I am not trying to in any way state here that I am against the catchable program, because I am not, but what I am saying is that in view of that, why in the world hasn't the Department long before this actually strongly initiated a study of this kind so that you would have some of the answers to the rough fish problem in this state?

MR. CALHOUN: May I answer that?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, I want you to.

MR. CALHOUN: It is a chain of circumstances which I think are not too difficult to understand. In the first place you will recall that the Department has been in rather desperate financial straits until quite recently so that anyone who recommended a new project to anybody would get the general answer, "That is highly desirable. We would like to do it. We don't have the money." The catchable trout program matured as

this financial crisis developed and it had to be operated. Obviously when you have these big trout production plants they are going to be operated.

That is the way of the world. So that the Department then has been in the position in recent years of not being able to do all of the things it would like to have done. The situation has been further aggravated by the pattern in the past five years of a tremendous load of water projects which simply demand the time of the fisheries people we have had, who would normally do this habitat improvement work.

When your house is burning you don't cut your front lawn. That is the position we have been in. We have had a handful of people who are qualified to do this kind of work and they have had to be diverted to water projects because there was a crisis and I don't think any of us can question the fact that it had to be done.

We are now in the position of having a matured catchable trout program which everyone seems to be agreed should stay where it is, and we now have an opportunity to build these other things which I am glad to see everybody thinks we need, and the thing that pleases me is that we have very large areas of agreement.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Dr. Calhoun, you are saying exactly the point I am making. You are cutting your lawn while your house is burning down. You have been for quite a few years because you have been progressing along this expensive catchable trout program and doing absolutely nothing really on stressing the need for the

curtailment of controlling rough fish. I know other programs in other phases of fish and game, big game, have been established, such as unit game managers, fifty-two some odd, which probably would not have been necessary. We could have utilized the wardens for that situation or other facets of the fish and game program, and it was desired by the Department so the Department really fought for it and it became a reality.

And, of course, this is only my personal opinion, but I don't think you have stressed enough interest in the eradication of your rough fish and the study that should have been under way. Now, how long do you anticipate it will take you to make this analysis?

MR. CALHOUN: Mrs. Davis, may I make one comment before I answer the question? I think I have given the impression in reply to one of your questions that we are not doing anything in this area. What I understood your question to apply to was the inland fisheries branch in Sacramento. Now, departmentwide we have, as Mr. Shannon has pointed out, a fairly substantial habitat improvement program.

We are not completely ignoring this question. And if I gave that impression, it was in error. What was that other question?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: How long do you anticipate that it will take you to complete this study you have in mind?

MR. CALHOUN: Well, the drafting is being done and we hope to have it in about two weeks.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I mean the procedures that must be used and the work that must be done -- how long do you feel it will take the Department to complete this type of investigation? I mean this has always been a very difficult question on which to receive a definite answer from the Department of Fish and Game. I know that many of the federal funds are just continuously used and I know investigations are necessary, but we never get any conclusive answer to them.

I mean these investigations just go on and on and this one I think is of great importance to the people of this State, and how long do you think it will take?

MR. CALHOUN: I would say my experience would indicate about five years and I would also say that we are terminating a series of investigations and will be giving results and that in general I think we have a pretty good record in that respect in inland fisheries.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: May I say something, Mrs. Davis? We have heard it bandied about many many times, that no conclusions are reached on our investigations. Every one of our investigations has a termination date and if anybody wants to name any one specific program and what conclusions have been reached, we will be more than glad to give them the conclusions.

We have reached lots of conclusions on lots of our projects. Many of them have been terminated, and I can't honestly accept the statement that we never reach any conclusions. Nobody

knows about them because we publish lots of conclusions and we are ready to furnish information on these to anybody who wants them and we would certainly be glad to furnish the committee any progress report, and we have done so, to both the committee and the Legislative Analyst in the past, a progress report on our investigations. We will be happy to do so now or in the future.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Progress reports aren't conclusive.

MR. SHANNON: Many times they have tentative conclusions that we work on in conducting further management work.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I realize that, but progress reports as an analysis are not a completed report on the subject matter. There are some that you have completed. I don't mean to imply that you haven't, but this has been one thought that has been brought up before our Fish and Game Committee.

MR. SHANNON: That is what disturbs me. It is continually brought up before the committee and the broad statement made that we don't reach conclusions, we have no results, and if you have specific programs in mind, we would like to know them and we would like to point out what conclusions have been reached, and I think the work that Mr. Sherman did in compiling a bibliography, if one would pursue that, one could see the work that has been done.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We will recess at this time until 1:30.

MR. BOHRMANN: May I just tie up two or three little loose strings in connection with the testimony given here so we can start on a new topic after lunch?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right.

MR. BOHRMANN: I want to clarify some things. In the first place, I would like to clarify the first resolution in 1955 asked for a study as to why young trout do not survive in streams populated by squawfish. In the rough fish that Dr. Calhoun listed at the request of Mr. Williamson, I believe, I perhaps didn't hear it, but I did not hear him mention the sculpin.

The sculpin looks something like a little catfish or is better known as bullhead. They are a very vicious predator and specifically they are very abundant in the Feather River gravel bars. They also would bite the dust if those waters were treated and it definitely would be an aid to our anadromous fish.

In fairness to the man that made this report which Mr. Calhoun considered in the Sports Fishing Institute which Mr. Calhoun considered was an optimistic thing. I gave you a condensation of it. I failed to state, so I will qualify it, that this biologist did not go overboard in estimating too much. In fairness to him and his article he says even if only half of these 86,000 fingerlings survive until next spring, it is still a considerable saving, so he did not definitely state -- perhaps I implied unwittingly that the 86,000 were expected to survive, but the biologist who made the report definitely did not imply it, and I want to so state to clear his record. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: I am going to have to leave for Los Angeles and I will look forward to a copy of the transcript.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: At this time we will recess until 1:30.

(Thereupon the noon recess was taken.)

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960, 1:30 O'CLOCK, P.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We will proceed with the testimony of Mr. Charles Bohrmann.

MR. BOHRMANN: We are down to paragraph number 22 under a caption "Salmon and Steelhead Trout".

22. If two types of stamps are used, that will provide additional funds for our migratory salmonids, which must have more aid and study if they are to remain an important part of our commercial and recreational fisheries. I will digress for a moment and add that we must learn how to adapt these migratory fishes to the impact of our civilization in order to perpetuate them for posterity and retain them as a necessary resource of the State of California.

The segregated stamp funds will provide more money from recreational licenses. In 1956 the Department reports show that about 88 percent of our salmon were taken commercially and about 12 percent recreationally. Then perhaps, more financial support for salmon fishery betterment from the commercial fishing industry may be in order to attain more salmon accomplishment. It appears obvious that the privilege tax for commercial salmon as set up by Section 8045-b and which is earmarked under Section 8055 for salmon propagation, should be increased in order to finance the increase of needed aid and study for salmon propagation. As this tax only applies to salmon landed in California, perhaps legislation should be introduced to apply a privilege tax

also to salmon shipped into California. This would seem a fair tax, because a large portion of California spawned salmon are taken in the northern states which ship salmon into California.

That is the end of my statement on steelhead and salmon.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee? Mr. Shannon, do you have any comments on Mr. Bohrmann's remarks concerning the steelhead and salmon?

MR. SHANNON: The only thing I have, Mrs. Davis, is that when the stamp system was inaugurated by the Legislature we considered the possibility of separate stamps for salmon, steelhead, trout and so forth, but it is complicated enough as it is now. In order to make it as simple as possible and as economical as possible we devised the two stamps both the same. Now, if you had one stamp for a particular species, you would have to buy that and then if you want to fish for something else you would have to pay for another, and as the system now works you buy two stamps and they are both the same.

Now, we realize that the statistics that would be gathered from such a system would be valuable, but in looking at the whole picture why we adopted this two stamp system in accord with the wishes of the Legislature.

There certainly can be improvement in this system and we would like to sit down with you, Mrs. Davis, some time in the near future and discuss this whole license system, including the stamp system, and maybe we can work something out that is more practical.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Bohrmann.

MR. BOHRMANN: Well, what I stated on that, Mrs. Davis, was merely that we have two identical stamps for clearly stated different purposes on the license. I am not advocating a new stamp for the anadromous fishes and inland fishes. I am merely proposing that two different stamps be printed in order that we can determine the revenue which should be used for inland fisheries including the anadromous fishes, which is actually your trout program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In other words, what you are saying, as far as the Associated Sportsmen are concerned, you are interested in knowing just what these programs are costing, what the revenue is that you are achieving from them and what you are spending for them, and by this method that you advocate here today, you would achieve this purpose?

MR. BOHRMANN: We feel quite confident it will because we do not think that just because there are roughly 700,000 trout anglers that both of the stamps on the license should be devoted to trout. We believe that the other resources also need additional aid as is very clearly demonstrated in Mr. Croker's salmon story, and we have nothing today to finance it unless we put those separate stamps on the license so that we know how much of that license we can fairly divert for use on salmon.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, Mr. Shannon, may I ask you what cost would you contemplate would be involved for the printing of these stamps where you are not asking for an additional stamp, but

actually a proper identification of the two stamps that you now already do print?

MR. SHANNON: There might be some additional cost, but not much.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: But not much.

MR. SHANNON: And we actually, our cost accounting program is bringing a lot of this information out we feel, and perhaps Charlie has a good point here. I am not shoving it aside. I think it deserves some study in relation to cost and perhaps we could in the future adopt such a system.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In other words, what you are saying is that you are going to review this and you feel that probably this is an excellent suggestion and I don't want to put words in your mouth, Walt, but it would seem to me that it would entertain a good check to see if this would not be a wise thing to do.

Now, can I be assured as Chairman of this committee so I can also notify by correspondence the rest of the members of this committee as to what your decision is going to be on this?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, we will check into it and report to you on this.

MR. BOHRMANN: It is not merely a cost basis, Madam Chairman, it is a cost versus income comparison that we are striving for.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is right. That is what would be achieved in the final program.

MR. BOHRMANN: On the pheasant program:

23. As early as July 24, 1955, after the study of the Chet Hart report, the ASC directed resolution ASC 55-22 to the Department of Fish and Game. This requested the Commission use the information in the Chet Hart report as a basis for their pheasant program; that the game farm production of pheasants be reduced to 50,000 birds the first year and to 35,000 the second year, in order to see what the results will be. This was not done. This resolution was reaffirmed at the September 1959 ASC convention to support the statement of the Director that the game farm program should be reduced. This constitutes ASC support for the reduction of the pheasant program to at least a pay as we go basis. For years the ASC pheasant committee has recommended habitat improvement in lieu of planting put and take pheasants in the Zone A area.

At this point may I very respectfully point out to you and through you to your committee, that when I have presented ASC recommendations to you I am not dividing the State of California into Northern California and Southern California on trout or pheasants. On the trout I referred to the ecological condition whereby I speak of the water as abundant and water short portions of the State of California upon which our wild and catchable fisheries must be predicated and in the same way on this pheasant program I am not referring to an arbitrary geographical division of the State, but rather on the basis of our pheasant populations and the need for an artificial program which might be needed to afford a certain amount of area sport where these birds are not

thriving.

We have pointed out that large scale distribution of gizzard gravel to fence corners and to drain and irrigation ditch banks will reduce road mortality of pheasants. That is up in this valley on our sedimentary soils where they must come to the side of the road for gizzard gravel. We have pointed out that in April and May when most fields are plowed up there appears to be a shortage of nesting and feeding area. That the right of way easement area of irrigation and drainage ditches and flood control levees might be leased and put into food and cover crops for pheasants, so increasing the carrying capacity of that locale to far better advantage than to plant hatchery birds.

We have wondered if Section 1529 which requires that pheasants planted on other than public lands be planted where they will receive adequate protection and be most likely to thrive and multiply, we wonder if this section does not specifically forbid put and take pheasant planting on lands other than public lands and on this we have reference to what we call cooperating farmers. Where a farmer accepts a plant of put and take birds from the Department of Fish and Game and he posts his property with a furnished sign "Hunting by Permission Only", very obviously he will give that permission to his choice friends and when the average Joe Blow hunter comes along he will say, "I am sorry, pal, but I am filled up. I am to the safe limit of my area." And it actually becomes just a nice little private pheasant subsidy and we don't believe that that should be done in the Zone A area.

We should not increase the pheasant population there. If this man who already owns the property wants to provide his friends some better pheasant hunting, let him do a little something for the pheasant on his property. Let him practice a little habitat improvement on his own. Let him leave a little seed for them, leave a little nesting area and he will have the same thing without it being at the expense of the average pheasant hunter who does not share in it.

That is the end of the pheasant presentation, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee?

MR. BOHRMANN: Conservation education. That is number 24.

24. It is the earnest recommendation of the ASC that the Department of Conservation Education be not curtailed, but rather expanded so it will provide more audio-visual public education by movies to schools and sportsmen's clubs and other interested public groups. By this we can obtain the conservation education which my predecessor felt was so necessary to go to groups and it might be advisable to put a little byline on the hunting and fishing regulations that such educational matters is available because he appeared to feel that he did not know those things were even available.

Now, practically every hunter and fisherman reads the regulations and if there were just a little paragraph on there giving the name and address of whom to contact for some of this audio-visual education which is so much in use in our schools

now and even in some industries, because it is so effective, I think the Department will get its program over a lot better than they are doing now. And that is the end of my recommendations on that program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In other words, Mr. Bohrmann, what you are saying is that you feel that all of the things that are printed by the Department in the section pertaining to conservation education is worthwhile but it actually isn't getting out to the sportsmen and to the other license buyer throughout the State adequately?

MR. BOHRMANN: That is definitely what I am saying. We have evidence of it, with all due respect to the gentleman ahead of me. There is no slam intended. This is a statement of fact under oath. People must be better informed if they are going to understand these programs and the basis for them, and the only way to get it out is to get it to the public and apparently this sporting goods dealer felt that stacking this stuff on his counter was not the answer because it was not taken.

Well, an audio-visual program where it can go out to the schools and to organizations would educate a lot of people on a revolving basis.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask Mr. Shannon a question here. Probably you would like to comment on this first, Mr. Shannon, and then I have some questions to ask you.

MR. SHANNON: Well, of course, there is always a problem of distribution. We try to distribute our material as best we can

and take quite a bit of effort to make adequate distribution. We do have audio-visual aids and so forth and the motion pictures that I spoke about earlier. As far as the actual distribution of our publications, I would like to have Bob Calkins set forth the procedure that we use in trying to get the best distribution.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Mr. Calkins.

MR. CALKINS: Madam Chairman, we have a variety of procedures on handling our material to get it to the public. The actual publications of the agency are distributed, for instance, Outdoor California, by mail principally under second class permit of the Post Office Department. We make both bulk supplies of various publications available to our field people to hand out at meetings, to distribute through the regional offices and also in their personal contacts.

In each of our offices in the State our regional offices as well as our field offices such as Bishop and San Diego and Eureka, we have racks in the entry halls with most of our publications available there for people interested in specific subjects.

I will agree with Mr. Bohrmann that these systems that we do have do not completely get the word to the 15 million people of the State of California, nor to the two million licence buyers, that is the fish and game license buyers.

As a matter of fact, if we gave one sheet of paper that we print, tried to distribute it to each citizen in the State we would come out about 11 million pieces of paper short insofar as the amount of money we have to spend through the printing division

is concerned. We do rely very heavily on the distribution of our motion pictures, copies of which are available in all of our regional offices throughout the State for borrowing free by whomever wishes to show them.

We contact schools and have successfully shown our pictures in the school systems of the State. One of the most successful operations last fall was the San Diego County school system in which several of our pictures were shown.

These are the ways in which we try and get the word out. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Calkins, have you ever considered in your news releases that you have, what is it, once a week or quite often, making a notation that these publications are available and so and so forth, or these visual aids, which would be of assistance as far as information to the general public as to where they could be obtained and what materials you have?

MR. CALKINS: We do that Mrs. Davis only when we have new publications becoming available. Perhaps it might be well for us to repeat this type of thing from time to time and I particularly like Mr. Bohrmann's suggestion, one I will admit we never thought about, of putting such information on the angling regulations booklets which are the most numerous of all things we publish.

Incidentally, I failed to mention we also receive quite a volume of mail daily in all of our regional offices and particularly here at headquarters, requesting information. I would

say we average 30 to 50 letter a day to my office alone in which we used printed material in answering questions about the fish and wildlife of California.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you try to mail this information out to the organized memberships that you are aware of throughout the State?

MR. CALKINS: We do endeavor to get a copy into the hands of the leaders, the president, for instance of each of the organizations, to make them aware of the publications and the motion pictures that are available. We have mailed, for instance, our list of publications and our list of motion pictures to each of the sportsmen's organizations in the State.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, the reason I ask that, evidently do you send him one copy and suggest if his membership is interested to contact you for more -- is that the approach you use?

MR. CALKINS: That is correct. We do this in order to avoid the type of thing that was described here today where we might be sending out a volume of material to somebody who didn't want it. We send bulk materials only to people who indicate an interest and a use for the materials which we have available.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well then, would it be a fair statement to assume that probably the president of that particular organization doesn't feel that for some reason or other, what it may be I don't know, that the membership might be interested in this material, or do you think it is probably due to the lack of time

for him to sit down and write you a letter, or what response have you had to this type of cooperation?

MR. CALKINS: We get a great many requests, Mrs. Davis. As a matter of fact the most recent item which we suggested for distribution through sportsmen's organizations was our litterbug control material.

We printed initially 100,000 of the little hand-out items and within two weeks of the time we sent a letter to all the sportsmen's groups in the State, that supply had virtually been exhausted by requests that came in as a direct result of that one particular item.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask, these technical reports and bulletins, the \$22,800, these are unofficial. I am sure you recognize that the figures that our report contains are the State Department of Fish and Game's figures on these things, is that correct?

MR. CALKINS: I believe that is correct, Mrs. Davis.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Now, can you tell me to whom do these technical reports and bulletins go? Do you more or less cooperate with other states on an exchange basis of this information, or just what is the situation?

MR. CALKINS: The principal distribution of the technical publications is to persons in the business of fish and game and other resource conservation. We have exchange mailing lists which take --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: With whom? I mean, roughly with whom,

if you can remember some of the people?

MR. CALKINS: Well, Mr. Croker's counterpart in Japan, for instance, and some of his staff and Norway and Spain. I think we have something like forty-some foreign countries on our exchange mailing list for this type of material. We distribute to other state game departments and also with the federal government, with the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, the people generally in the resource conservation field who are interested in the technical advances that our people are developing.

We in turn receive their material with which our people can work. In addition we have numerable copies which go to the libraries throughout the country and the world. The University of California puts into their libraries copies of this material. A considerable number of the technical publications to to the libraries and the schools which have research programs in these fields.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask Mr. Bohrmann a question? What sort of program do the sportsmen have on education and information? Do you have a program?

MR. BOHRMANN: No, we do not, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Don't you think a program of the sportsmen would help in this problem that we have?

MR. BOHRMANN: I say we do not have a program, sir. We do have the official minutes of all of our meetings in which are

set forth the discussions that take place on the floor and the action taken by the Associated Sportsmen, and we send out approximately 600 copies of the official minutes of the Associated Sportsmen every month to not only our own club officers--

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I am talking about disseminating information that the Department put out. Don't you read these reports and don't you go through them?

MR. BOHRMANN: Definitely. I have "California Fish and Game" on file since 1943.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Do you discuss them with your members?

MR. BOHRMANN: I take them with me constantly for reference. I have the bulletin of the Sports Fishing Institute on file here. For the past three years I have Outdoor California on file.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Personally I think the Department is doing a good job on information. I see it down south. I don't know about the north.

MR. BOHRMANN: We concur definitely in that.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: But you want to expand it?

MR. BOHRMANN: We would like to see a greater variety of movies available and as was suggested here to give the information to the public that these movies are available, and you definitely can reach most of the interested people by a modest little amount of publicity in the publications that they naturally get in connection with their license purchases which

are the hunting and fishing regulations.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Have the sportsmen ever seen these movies?

MR. BOHRMANN: Well, the gentleman that preceded me didn't know much about where these things were available or what they could get for organizations, but if you had it on the license --

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I think if the organized sportsmen would have a dinner and invite the legislators and show these pictures --

MR. BOHRMANN: We definitely have.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: (Continuing) and have some sort of meeting on some of these problems, I think you would do a better job. I have only had one invitation since I have been in the Legislature from any sports organization.

MR. BOHRMANN: Well I know one time --

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I am easy to get along with.

MR. BOHRMANN: (Continuing) you were invited to the California Fish Conservation Committee in 1948 because I was one of the hosts at that time.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I mean my district. I think the Department is doing a good job.

MR. BOHRMANN: I think they are doing an excellent job and we want to encourage them. This is the full purpose of my statement, was to support and confirm that the ASC is very much in accord with the program to a point, but we would like to see

it expanded a little more.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: On these high schools -- I wouldn't encourage showing these pictures to the eighth graders, but I think the seniors and college students would be good.

MR. BOHRMANN: I would like to see them go to the eighth grader.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: My girl sees pictures and she doesn't know much about it.

MR. BOHRMANN: But up here in our fish and game abundant areas, the eighth graders are much more aware than they are in the fish shortage areas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: In the metropolitan areas we don't have that.

MR. BOHRMANN: When you asked about this, sir, I would like to point out one fact to you that the efforts of us sportsmen, my appearance here, that is all unpaid, and in most instances as a reward for the diligent work that we accomplish, we are allowed to pay our own expenses because sportsmen's organizations are busted affairs. They are just not too well financed.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I at this time ask Mr. Calhoun a question. Dr. Calhoun, since these technical reports and bulletins are on an exchange basis with foreign countries as well as other states, have you then been aware of the points that have been made here by Mr. Bohrmann today, of the trout program and the rough fish program in the State of Virginia, West Virginia? You have been aware of that? Have you received that

document?

MR. CALHOUN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: What is your opinion? Do you feel that they are doing a pretty good job as far as from a technical standpoint in that report?

MR. CALHOUN: Are you referring now specifically to the West Virginia report?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes.

MR. CALHOUN: That report is not a technical report, Mrs. Davis. To keep the record straight, and I think Mr. Bohrmann will confirm this, this was simply a summary statement in the periodic bulletin of the Sports Fishing Institute which is a news letter so to speak, in this business.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right then, did you make any attempt to make contact with the State of West Virginia to inform yourself as to all of the things and ramifications that were involved as far as their success in this program is concerned?

MR. CALHOUN: As I understand the report, Mrs. Davis, this is a statement of the fact that they chemically treated this river, that they planted some 80,000 fingerling trout and they hope to reap the benefits next year, and we will be much interested in the results and will expect to hear from them, but I think at this time we know all that can be learned about it.

They have done this. It now remains to be seen what the results will be. We will be greatly interested.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In the past, did you undertake an

extensive program as far as the alleviation of rough fish in Russian River is concerned?

MR. CALKINS: Yes, Mrs. Davis.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Was it successful in your opinion?

MR. CALKINS: It was successful in this respect that from all indications there was a substantial decline temporarily in the predatory rough fish. There was a substantial increase temporarily in the young steelhead. There was a very substantial run of steelhead, adult steelhead, several years later which probably stemmed from this, and the rough fish are now back again and here again I don't -- that is simply a fact. If this is to be done in the Russian River, it will apparently have to be done periodically.

In the Upper Spanish Creek area in the Feather River a year or so ago we treated some 80 miles of that drainage and the rough fish are already back in that area again and the results are still uncertain, although we would expect at least a temporary benefit.

The thing that has to be determined is whether or not this is the best way, whether or not the barriers are the best way, whether we can find something that will perhaps utilize the rough fish.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I see. All right. Thank you. Any questions by members of the committee? Mr. Shannon, do you have any other comment? Mr. Bohrmann.

MR. BOHRMANN: I would just like to make this comment,

Madam Chairman, that it is recognized that once a stream is treated you have not eliminated the population. You have merely reduced it, and in order to hold the ground that you have gained constant additional attrition against the species is essential or they will immediately come back.

Now, nobody has the positive answer, but I do believe that perhaps a practical suggestion could at least be given a trial. It is a well known fact that fish can be shocked by electricity. They can be stunned by electricity. There is a peculiar quirk that a larger fish is more susceptible than a small fish. In other words, it takes a heavier current to stun a small fish than it does a large fish.

As an observer along the Middle Fork of the Feather River I have noted that during the low water months of August and September there are any number of schools of rough fish, these squawfish, which by that time have grown to two or two and a half inches long, and I would be very happy if the Department of Fish and Game would make an appointment and send a man up to the Middle Fork of the Feather River next year in late August or early September when these young fish are visible, and I would through the county fish and game monies provide them with two or three helpers to help carry the equipment and let the Fish and Game men just make the attempt to see what we can do and see if we cannot discourage the increase of the rough fish population there by stunning those little fellows in the shallow waters where they are readily available and then dip

them out, and saying that I recognize we will only touch a small portion of that stream, but after all your cost is not too extensive either and if we can reduce those we are confident that for all those little fellows that we take we are reducing a predator against the newly hatched trout the next year and we would like to see that thing given a trial, at least a trial, because it is realized that we must practice constant attrition against the species after the first treatment of the stream because the record shows they come right back.

In addition to that, there have been proposed barriers for these fish because they have a certain migratory tendency. We have the large lakes on the Feather River formed by the Pacific Gas and Electric diversion dams and we have streams between those lakes, and it is believed that these large squawfish in the winter period drift downstream into these lakes and in the spring of the year or early summer as the water warms up they ascend these streams to spawn and to dwell within the streams where they will hatch.

If an old fashioned indian fish trap were put into a place that could be seined we would practice attrition by seining the fish out of there periodically, every two or three days. We would sein the fish out, destroy the rough fish and put the fish up above the rack.

Later in the season we could remove the rack. In that way you are practicing constant attrition against the large spawners and as long as you can keep them from attaining high

production size, I don't think the rough fish, as long as you can keep most of them from attaining high production, I don't think the rough fish population in turn will be as rapid as it would be without such attrition measures.

I acknowledge that this is theory only and not knowledge.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, any comment?

MR. SHANNON: Just a comment that we have been using shocking equipment for years, and know what it can do and what it can't do. Granted that we could eliminate rough fish by this means, it is an expensive proposition and you can only treat certain parts of the stream because you have to have a large generator which we haul on a big truck.

Consequently you can only treat those areas that are real close to the road. That is one trouble we have. It is an expensive proposition and it is a dangerous proposition. Using high voltages with men in the water, one has to be extremely careful that there is no contact with the water, that the person does not touch the water, or he will get the same treatment as the fish does.

So we could certainly explore this on an experimental basis. However, we are pretty confident we know what it will do already. To treat large sections of streams for rough fish control by this method is expensive and you can't reach the whole stream. There would be many, many areas of the stream like the Feather River that you can't get to and couldn't treat.

Granted it has use in certain places.

MR. BOHRMANN: Madam Chairman, I am afraid Mr. Shannon-- I didn't make myself clear to Mr. Shannon. I stated that the Candian fisheries have a pack sack battery operated shocker which they use to stun samples of little salmon. I am not proposing that the entire Feather River be treated, but I stated that after the first program of poisoning we can go into the shallow waters during August and September, the shore waters five or six inches deep, and in those little puddles right next to the shore you will see swarms of these little rough fish.

They are about two and a half inches long. They can be treated right there without hazard because the man doesn't even have to get into the water, although he must have rubber precautions of course and we would provide men who would dip these little fellows out when they are stunned.

I don't propose to use enough current to kill them, but just enough so they can be taken out with a specially devised flat bottom dip net and simply go along the shore of the stream and reduce the young fish before they grow into large spawners.

Now, that does not entail carrying a heavy generator that can only be hauled in a pickup. This is a pack sack shocking battery operated affair which is used for small fish and if it will stun small salmon like this it will also stun those rough fish and it should be given a trial, particularly in the Russian River area, I'd say.

MR. SHANNON: This could be done. There is no question about it. The thing that we have to consider is the expense of all the lakes we have in California plus the 26,000 miles of stream. Now, in critical areas possibly we could do some good by the method that Charlie describes here. We are not adverse to trying it in real critical situations to see just what can be done.

However, on a large scale, to do this is an expensive proposition.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, it looks to me, Mr. Shannon, as though we are having an expensive proposition for the fine trout that we are having for breakfast, lunch and dinner, so I don't know which is the worst. Now, Mr. Bohrmann, may I ask you a question?

Are you aware of the requests for water projects that the Department of Fish and Game has requested as far as staff is concerned to go into that particular phase of it?

MR. BOHRMANN: I have a section under miscellaneous, Mrs. Davis, and then I go to cost of water projects and water quality investigations.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do you concur that the Department of Fish and Game should embark upon this staff personnel to go into the water project field? Do you concur with that?

MR. BOHRMANN: Are you asking if I personally concur with it?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, if you personally concur with it.

MR. BOHRMANN: I definitely do, Mrs. Davis, for this reason that even though we do not always agree with the Department of Fish and Game, we recognize that these men are now putting those investigations on a scientific basis. I was very amazed and surprised at the thoroughness of the evidence which was collected on the Mokelumne River in a good brochure, a well planned, convincing thing, almost as sizeable as the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report, about the thickness of that, but mimeographed, and I consider that they have done a very splendid job on that and in connection with these water projects, we feel that regardless of who pays for those studies, they should be conducted by the Department personnel under Department direction. Is that the point you want?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I am talking about the cost. Do you feel that the license buyer can assume this cost?

MR. BOHRMANN: Definitely not.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well this is the point.

MR. BOHRMANN: We heartily concur with the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report which states that other financing for this should be investigated, and the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report also tells us that the water resources board, or department, I am not sure -- I have it in writing here later on -- furnishes services to prospective projects and diverters and they reimburse them for it.

In fact, when I testified before the State Water Right Board on the Middle Fork of the Feather River, the

Associated Sportsmen had to pay for recording my testimony there, so they are on a reimbursed basis on those things. They are simply handling a liaison.

That is exactly what the Department of Fish and Game should do in connection with these projects. They should handle the liaison whereby the fishery requirements which they must support by evidence and not by opinion, shall be set forth by the Department at the expense of the diverter or the project. That is what we recommend.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions on this? Does that conclude your testimony or do you have --

MR. BOHRMANN: No, I have a little miscellaneous here, but instead of going into it in detail because this is getting long, under this miscellaneous we do not have any fact and we are actually asking questions.

It is the stated purpose of this portion of our recommendations and testimony to assure that all special functions provided in the California Fish and Game Code shall at least be self supporting from the licenses and/or fees derived, after overhead and patrol, and so forth, have been deducted, in order that there will be no unfair deficit paid from the other income to the fish and game preservation fund.

And I list the Marine Research Committee, the Marine Fisheries Commission, kelp bed investigations, kelp harvest and commercial activities. Under commercial activities we have domesticated game breeding. We have commercial hunting clubs

and we have pheasant clubs, both commercial and private, and it has always been a very debatable question in the past if the licenses and fees set for the above groups are adequate to fully cover the cost of the services and patrol rendered to these facilities by the Department.

It is therefore respectfully proposed that the Department should be required to keep a full itemization of the time, cost and so forth of all services, inspections and patrol, overhead and retirement pro rata expended on these facilities each year in order to assure that these facilities pay their way.

31. In addition to the above, it must be fully obvious from past reports, that in the Zone A pheasant habitat area, these pheasant clubs harvest more wild birds than their own planted birds. Therefore, since they operate under longer season and far greater bag limit than the licensed hunter, it would appear only fair that these pheasant clubs, both private and commercial in the Zone A area pay a privilege tax into the general pheasant fund of at least \$1.00 for each native bird they kill on these areas, to compensate the resource for their special privilege extended season and bag limit.

This shall not apply to pheasant clubs in the Zone B area, because if they can set up natural propagation in the B area, they are fulfilling the basic purpose for which the California sportsmen originally supported the "game management law" in the late 1930's.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Do I understand, Mr. Bohrmann,

that all these investigations on these special items should be paid for by the people who receive the benefit?

MR. BOHRMANN: That is the general idea of it, Mr. Thomas.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: How about commercial people in that business, should they pay for all the surveys?

MR. BOHRMAN: Mr. Thomas, please do not misconstrue. I am not attempting to begin a program of earmarked funds. It is merely a case where we know what services are rendered to some of these special activities like kelp harvest, and just let us make sure --

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Isn't the kelp harvest study of benefit to the sportsmen?

MR. BOHRMANN: Perhaps I am uninformed on that point, Mr. Thomas. I can't know everything. Perhaps I am getting an education from you which I appreciate. If that is the purpose of the kelp harvest --

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: It is to show whether or not the crop is getting better and what effect it has on the ocean fisheries, which is the sportsman's fish.

MR. BOHRMANN: It was assumed when we sought the kelp studies that they were for the benefit of the kelp harvester. If that assumption is wrong, I acknowledge it and I definitely retract anything I said because being only human, sir, I can make mistakes, too, and that is the thing.

In other words, I definitely want this thing to be on

a fair basis and if I make a mistake, I am ready to acknowledge it, sir, and if that study is for the benefit of the fishermen I have nothing to say. I am mistaken.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: That is what I tell people in my business -- they use kelp and sell it to the ice cream people. I am surprised to find ice cream has a lot of kelp in it.

MR. BOHRMANN: I just had a wrong impression.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Maybe we should get the ice cream people.

MR. BOHRMANN: I was out on a limb and it broke.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Maybe the Department --

MR. BOHRMANN: Mrs. Davis, I do have one more --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you like to clarify this, Mr. Thomas, with the Department?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: When people cut this kelp, they rent it by the acre or lease it out and they only cut a certain amount under the direction of the Fish and Game Department, as I understand? It is all directed by the Fish and Game Commission?

MR. SHANNON: You are correct, Mr. Thomas. The kelp study investigation was started approximately four years ago and it was started for several purposes, but one of the main ones was to determine the effect of kelp harvesting on the fisheries. That was one.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: The sportsmen will benefit whatever

the outcome of that investigation.

MR. BOHRMANN: And so will marine fishing also probably.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other comment?

MR. BOHRMANN: Well, Mrs. Davis, in view of the time, I have several paragraphs here setting up the need of fish screens. I don't believe I have to sell anyone on this committee on the need of fish screens and the fact we are losing a lot of migratory fishes in our diversions in some years. It does not exist every year.

A great loss does not exist every year. Under present law one half of the cost of screen construction plus one half of operation and maintenance is paid by each of the fish and game preservation fund and by the diverter, and in case of diversions where the diverter already has paid for a screen now not operative, the diverter has discharged his legal responsibility, and the full construction cost must be borne by the fish and game preservation fund.

In addition to that, the diverter not only must provide the site for the screen, and the owner of a dam the site for a fishway, but they also must give the State a signed "save harmless" statement, whereby they appear to assume full liability in connection with these respective structures. If this is a true statement -- I am merely repeating information given to the ASC, then an inequity exists, which must be resolved by the Legislature as a primary step toward stopping diversion losses of salmonid fishes.

It is deemed by the Associated Sportsmen of California that it is an economic impossibility that one-half of the new construction, plus full construction of replacement screens and one-half of operation and maintenance of all fish screens, can be paid out of the fish and game preservation fund and leave sufficient residue for even bare minimum operations of all of the other essential functions of the Department of Fish and Game.

These screens, like the water project and water quality studies, appear to be another instance where the present law requires the license buyers to protect a resource against conditions beyond their control. This we deem to be another inequity requiring legislative remedy whereby these screens must be constructed, operated and maintained by funds other than the fish and game preservation fund, under the paid supervision of the Department of Fish and Game in a similar manner as water project sponsors pay for the services of the California Water Resources Board who work with said project sponsors.

No one denies a diverter a fair share of the public resource of water, but it is against all basic justice to appear to so license said diverter to destroy the public resource of fish in order to provide water to such diverter for profit.

From the foregoing, it can be readily seen that our diversion screening program is at the same stalemate where it has been these past eighty years while untold fishery losses have been wantonly wasted due to lack of remedial action. These fishery losses have caused a severe financial loss to the economy

of this State. It obviously is a stalemate which can only be resolved by legislative action. It is for such remedial legislative action that I am appealing to you and to your Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game, not only for the Associated Sportsmen of California, but in the name of all users of our California salmonid fisheries, both recreational and commercial, who want to see this resource increased by natural propagation.

When it is realized, that the record appears to show that today there only remains five percent of the original 6,000 miles of Central Valley's spawning area for salmon, we obviously have no downstream migrants to lose in diversions, if this fishery is to remain abundantly productive, and a major factor in the great economy of this State of California.

Therefore, it is most respectfully presented to the thinking of you and your interim committee that this stalemate may be resolved by a subcommittee of your interim committee. It is earnestly believed that in low water years when the migrants move downstream slowly, our diversion losses are astronomical. This may account to some extent for the known and recognized fluctuation of the salmonid fishery population which in years of low productivity is a serious hardship upon the commercial fishermen as well as upon those who invest their money to cater to the recreational anglers for these fish, also the poor license buyer.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions of Mr. Bohrmann at this time? Thank you very much.

MR. BOHRMANN: Madam Chairman, this concludes my presentation. The Associated Sportsmen have instructed me to sincerely thank you for this opportunity that you have given us to attempt to present the fact to you and your committee.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much. Senator Erhart.

SENATOR ERHART: I would like to have permission through the Chair to ask the Department a question which I think is very vital to a great many of the people in the sportsmen's groups as well as the Department.

At the last Session of the Legislature I introduced a bill co-sponsored by many other members of the Senate to give the wardens additional police powers and it was passed by both houses. There was some opposition to the bill and as a result I introduced a resolution asking the Department to set up a training program.

The wardens approved it, the Department approved it, I believe, and I was wondering how far that training program has progressed, and I would like to ask or direct that question to Mr. Shannon.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, you have heard the question.

MR. SHANNON: Yes. Senator Erhart, immediately after the passing of the resolution we took steps to set up a training program through the training committee. The training committee appointed a subcommittee composed of law enforcement specialists to plan a training program in accordance with the resolution, a

more comprehensive training program than we have ever had. As a result of that we set up an orientation basic course for new wardens. We have held some of those schools already. We held one out here at the Police Academy not long ago.

We also are providing a two week refresher course for all the old wardens. In other words, one year we will take half of the older men and the next year we will take the other half so that every two years a warden will go through a refresher course.

Now, it happens that right at present we are having one of those schools in progress at the Riverside Law Enforcement Training Center which is a recognized facility for that type of thing. These fellows, half the wardens, are down there now receiving this refresher course. In addition to that we have set up a supervisory training course for captains and wildlife protection supervisors to aid them in supervising this law enforcement personnel.

We also are providing for on the job training so that when the warden is out there he not only gets training when he goes to school, but his supervisor has a continual on the job training in various aspects of law enforcement.

We paid particular attention to the requirements of the resolution, that is in public relations, laws of search and seizure, rules of evidence and so forth and we incorporated those into our program.

SENATOR ERHART: How much money is that going to cost

the Department?

MR. SHANNON: So far we haven't made an estimate of the money. We have been operating within our present funds so far. Now, as this thing progresses it may cost some additional money, but not too much. The reason for that is that the facilities that we use require rather minimum expenses.

In other words, the amount of money used to keep a man at one of these schools is not much more than he would ordinarily require while on duty, expenses you see. So we just send him to school and pay for the school.

SENATOR ERHART: How many weeks does that involve, how many weeks is he off duty?

MR. SHANNON: For the refresher course it is two weeks. He is off duty for two weeks.

SENATOR ERHART: And you don't try to replace him in the field during that time?

MR. SHANNON: No, we just use the wardens that are left there. They double up and cover his district for a couple of weeks and we try to plan these schools so that it is -- we don't really have any slack periods anymore, but in the periods where there is less work compared to the real busy parts of the year.

SENATOR ERHART: There is no objection to doing this as far as the Department is concerned?

MR. SHANNON: No, we are all in favor and we are not only proceeding along these lines with our law enforcement people,

we are devising similar courses for all people in the Department.

SENATOR ERHART: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

MR. BOHRMANN: Madam Chairman, pardon me, please. For the sake of time I made a few skips in my written presentation and you have a copy of it and may I respectfully request that the record as written, which I can support, except the kelp, be included in your record.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That will be the case.

MR. BOHRMANN: Before I began to testify I had three extra copies which I gave you to lend out and I would like to have at least one of them because I have no copy for the press. I always keep a file copy. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You would like another one for your own file copy?

MR. BOHRMANN: I have a file copy and the Association has a file copy.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Bohrman.

(Following are the excerpts included in Mr. Bohrman's statement which he did not read.)

"Marine Research Committee:

"26. This committee is set up by Sections 725 to 732. It is financed by a special privilege tax under Section 8046. No allocation of F & G Funds to this committee is shown in Mrs. Davis' report. Does this committee pay the salaries, expenses, retirement, compensation insurance and headquarters overhead of Fish and Game personnel serving this committee?

"Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission:

"27. This Commission is set up by a compact under Section 14000 of the F & G Code. The Budget Recapitulation shows an appropriation of \$17,900 under item No. 13, for this function. However, no specific source of revenue for this cost has been found in the F & G Code.

"28. Are the salaries, expenses, overhead, etc., of Fish & Game personnel serving on this Commission, or working for same paid out of this appropriation, or are these costs paid from the F & G Preservation Fund. Should not some specific and adequate source of revenue for this Commission be provided in the Fish & Game Code, so these costs will be paid by those benefitting from this Commission?

"Kelp-Bed Investigations:

"29. \$50,000 has been set up for these investigations under item No. 14 of the recapitulation. What is the annual kelp revenue? Kelp harvesting is only permitted under certain restrictions. Therefore it appears to be a function requiring marine patrol while harvesting and land patrol upon landing the kelp. It being a private enterprise function for profit, through the Department of Fish & Game and the Commission, it must at least pay its own way. Therefore we most respectfully recommend to this Committee that a check be made upon the total revenue derived from kelp harvesting to determine if the proceeds from kelp harvest pays for all the services same requires and/or receives.

"32. With seasonal precipitation and seasonal draught, stored water must be termed the life blood of the economy of California. With the development of this State, more and more water storage projects are planned and/or constructed each year. The effect of each of these projects upon our fish and wildlife appears to pose a different set of conditions, principally affecting fish.

"33. Each of these conditions first must be sought out and established and then carefully studied, if competent and effective provisions are to be found whereby a minimum of damage will result to the fishery.

"34. It is only in comparatively recent years that very extensive and very expensive studies are being made, particularly on water projects and diversions affecting California's migratory salmonid fishes, the salmon and steelhead trout.

"35. But the absolute need for these very extensive and very expensive fishery studies is very definitely demonstrated when we view the alleged damage done to the Klamath River salmonid fishery by nearly forty years of peak power surge. Below the powerhouse the flow has varied from a peak of about 3,200 cubic feet per second, followed by a sudden drop to about 200 cfs or less. This sudden drop in water volume and level is alleged to have destroyed astronomical numbers of young and adult fish, as well as much fish food, by stranding.

"36. No fishery studies and/or provisions appear to have been made prior to the construction of Friant Dam. Upon

activation of this first large federal project in California it is alleged that 10% of the production of California's Central Valley salmon was simply wiped out because the San Joaquin River was dried up. It was dried up in spite of former Section 525 of the old Fish & Game Code (present Section 5937) which forbids such drying up on streams with a fishery resource. An unsuccessful lawsuit to restore flow to the San Joaquin River cost our Fish and Game Preservation Fund another \$65,000 according to the 'Central California Sportsman'.

"37. With this alleged stream drying precedent set on the San Joaquin River by our powerful federal government, our Fish & Game Preservations Fund will be subjected to still greater expense in attempting to preserve our California Fisheries on water projects. Today we appear to be faced with an alleged attempt of the City of San Francisco to dry up about twelve miles of fine wild trout stream on the Tuolumne River below O'Shaunessy Dam. This is not for the availability of municipal water, but to generate electric power for profit. On the Mokelumne River we have the situation where it is alleged that the East Bay Municipal Utility District contends that after construction of Comache Dam they will have no water to spare for salmon and steelhead fishery spawning area release. It is the evaluation of the Department of Fish & Game that the presently remaining spawning gravels on the Mokelumne River will accommodate between 60,000 and 80,000 spawning salmon. They are unable to reach an agreement whereby spawning facilities for only about 15,000 salmon will be provided. So in addition to this possible fishery loss, our Department of Fish and Game has spent over \$19,000 for study, plus the services of a Deputy

Attorney General at about \$8 an hour.

"38. While I have no figure for the present annual cost of these studies, which also must include water quality investigations, the Department of Fish and Game told CWF that the new budget will reflect an increase of about \$260,000 for this work next year.

"39. The ASC recognizes that this work must be done by the Department of Fish and Game personnel, but we also realize that it must be financed from some source other than the Fish and Game Preservation Fund, because the need for these expenditures is beyond the control of the Department of Fish and Game and/or the license buyers.

"40. In this respect we hereby state full ASC concurrence with Chapter VII, Item 5(2) on page 103 of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report, which recommends that outside financing for this substantial cost should be explored. This is definitely a function of this committee. Other states have such laws.

"Money and Revised Legislation Needed for Fishscreens:

"41. Fishscreens in the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report are considered on page No. 75, Recommendation No. 5. On page No. 74 is concurrence with the need for fishscreens. The report infers that legislation is needed. In this the ASC concurs.

"42. 'California's Fish & Game Program', as published about ten years ago by the Wildlife Conservation Board considers fishscreens beginning page No. 45. This information may be summarized on a current basis that for the past eighty years the State has struggled with the problem of keeping fish out of diversions.

Each successive Commission started out with firm resolve to do something about it, but it remains the major deficiency in our California migratory fishery program today. In consideration of time I will let the foregoing suffice as evidence for the need of very much screening. In so doing I stand ready to present extensive further testimony if requested by this Committee."

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: The next witness will be Mr. Robert Vile, President of the Ocean Fish Protective Association.

(Thereupon Mr. Vile was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

MR. VILE: Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert Vile. I am President of the Ocean Fish Protective Association. Our organization differs from most of the California sportsmen's councils as we specialize in ocean fishery problems. We represent a segment of this State's army of sportsmen referred to as the ocean angler.

Therefore our testimony today will be primarily directed to the income and expenditures of the marine resources operation. However, we have established a policy on the catchable trout and the pheasant programs. Our policy is and has been for a number of years that this type of program should be self sustaining. We concur in the trout and pheasant policy established by the California Wildlife Federation here on January 17, 1960.

We believe that the policy of the Federation is definitely a step in the right direction. This is all I care to comment on the trout and pheasant unless the committee would like to ask some

questions.

I might give you just a little of the history of the organization if I might on the trout policy if you would like that. Approximately five to six years ago this organization took the Department of Fish and Game on over the catchable trout policy and I think we lost a lot of friends at that time which I believe in my opinion have wakened up to the fact themselves today.

We had quite a problem there when we had a straight angling license and we definitely felt that too much money was being devoted to the trout policy at that time and not enough money coming into the marine resources which is now the marine resources operation of the Department.

We felt also at that time that we got quite a run-around on the part of the Department and in a way we couldn't blame them because the truth was there that when you went out and caught one limit of trout you had eaten up the entire value of your angling license. Since that time we have had the trout stamp come along and I think it has eased the problem some and I think under this, if the Commission should accept the policy that the Department has offered, this thing eventually may straighten up.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Then, you are saying you are accepting that policy both on trout and pheasants as being recommended to the Commission?

MR. VILE: No, not by the Department, but the California Wildlife Federation Policy.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Oh, the California Wildlife policy?

MR. VILE: Yes. If the committee has no other questions on the trout or the pheasant --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Do any of the members have questions of Mr. Vile pertaining to the trout program and his recommendations? Evidently not. Will you proceed?

MR. VILE: All right. I would like to review just briefly with the committee the income and some of the expenditures of the marine resources operation.

The largest contributor to the marine resources operation is the angling license money, assisted by the Dingle-Johnson funds, and we feel that the sportsmen are paying their way as far as the ocean fishery is concerned.

However, we would like to review with you a number of taxations on the commercial fishery which we feel should come under review. We feel that they are inadequate and should be reviewed by this committee to determine whether further revenue could not be derived for the marine resources operation.

Take the salmon tax, for instance, which is a half cent per pound on the salmon. That is not a very large tax and does not produce enough revenue to more than offset the money that is being spent on salmon today. Now, the salmon is both considered a sport and a commercial fish and if you were to look to it on a fifty-fifty basis, then this salmon tax is way out of line.

Also I would like to bring out that the salmon tax is definitely earmarked for salmon and for no other purpose so this

fund here could not be used for any other phase of the over-all research into the ocean, you might say.

I have other things here. I don't know whether the committee cares to comment on the salmon tax or not.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Proceed.

MR. VILE: I would like to bring to your attention that the tax on shellfish is one cent per gallon shucked. This revenue is also marked for shellfish only. Now, the revenue derived from shellfish is combined with the revenue derived from the kelp tax and you can't break it down to find out what it is, but it is still very minor.

The money taken in for the pelagic fish such as the sardine, the anchovy, the jack, the mackerel, pacific mackerel and the others, is also a tax that is definitely earmarked for that specific research project.

The tax on this is \$1 per ton. Now, if the marine research committee is in a plight for money, it seems to me they would look to an adjustment of this tax in order to compensate for the loss of funds that is going to cut back on their program.

On other fish delivered such as tuna and members of the tuna family, there also is a tax of a dollar per ton, but this tax is not earmarked. However, in going over the figures from the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report here, it definitely shows that money taken for tuna in the way of taxes is spent right back for tuna in research.

I would like to touch on kelp as the gentleman did before

me. It is interesting to note that in leasing kelp beds that the minimum that can be paid to the Department is \$40 per square mile. The actual tax itself is three cents per wet ton. In addition to that there is a privilege tax of five cents per wet ton, so all the kelp harvested is being paid for at eight cents per ton.

Now, certainly their business is more valuable than what they are paying in taxes as far as harvesting this resource is concerned. I will have to agree that the tax, or pardon me, the kelp program that has been carried on for the last five years was primarily started in the interests of the sports fishing, but I notice that also the commercial industry is contributing money towards that and I believe that comes out of the money for the pelagic fish fund.

But here are a few of our resources that are being harvested commercially for profit and yet are yielding a very minor amount of money. I believe in total that the kelp tax and the tax on shucked shelled fish brings the State about \$5,000 a year. Now, I am just curious if the State can even afford to keep books on it for \$5,000 a year.

We are very much interested in this kelp program. You haven't heard much from us on kelp for a period of time because we have been waiting for the results of this study that cost \$250,000 to find out what the problem is with the kelp in this State, and at our delegates meeting on the 20th we will be brought up to date on what has been done on this kelp research and will also see a number of films along that line also. I think it is

time now to make a decision as to whether or not kelp cutting is harmful to our fishing. I would also like to point out one thing here, that the entire total revenue received from the commercial industry amounted to \$584,000 according to this report from the Department, and I presume this is for the 1958-59 season.

Pardon me, Madam Chairman, may I direct this question to the Department. I would like to know if this is for 1959-60?

MR. SHANNON: Estimated.

MR. VILE: \$584,000, and I believe the estimated revenue from the angling license is in the neighborhood of \$750,000.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, is that correct? Are the years he is quoting 1959-60, and what is the amount?

MR. SHANNON: Well, the revenue for the commercial is \$584,000, commercial fishing.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And the other figure you used is what?

MR. VILE: \$750,000 coming from angling revenue not included in the Dingle-Johnson funds.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: \$750,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: From angling licenses?

MR. VILE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: How much was the commercial fishery?

MR. VILE: \$584,000. I think there needs to be an adjustment here.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Have you done anything in your statement there about the party boat operators that are making millions of dollars down south a year? It is one of the biggest

businesses in the south.

MR. VILE: Yes, it is a big business.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Shall we increase their tax too?

MR. VILE: Well, I think if you so desire, I think that it is up to you. I am trying to bring a few of these things out.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I don't want you to leave them out.

MR. VILE: I would point this out, they pay a license fee of \$3 a year which is a minor license fee, I will have to admit. You have to take into consideration -- I am not defending them -- I am here representing the angler, not the people in business. These people are not actually fishing, they are transporting people to fish.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: They make a business out of it. They are making a business out of it.

MR. VILE: That is very true, I will grant you that, but they are not taking the fish.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: The canneries in my district employ thousands of people whose livelihood depends on the sardines and anchovies. Do you want to tax them out of business? They are having a tough time now.

MR. VILE: I can understand that, Mr. Thomas. I don't want to tax them out of business.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: They pay \$1 a ton for fish landed at the cannery. When you have three or four hundred thousand tons coming in that is quite a bit of money.

MR. VILE: Well, at a dollar a ton it is.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I would like to ask the Department's views on some of your recommendations.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: It might be interesting to point out that the tax on these important species has doubled in the last ten years you might say, and at the same time the revenues have gone down. In other words, although the taxes have doubled, the revenue to the State has gone down.

Now, this is because of the reduced take principally of the sardine and other pelagic fishes. We would not want to say at this time that we would recommend an increase in taxes for other commercial species.

We would like to devote some thought to that in relation to the benefits gained by the industry and so forth. At this time we wouldn't want to make any recommendation for an increase in taxes.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: When you do that I would like to have you consider the sportsmen on these party boats who have commercial licenses and sell their fish to the markets. Maybe we can tax them a little, too.

MR. SHANNON: That is an important problem too.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: When you get into the field of taxation --

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Vile, do you have any comments to make on the points that have been discussed here?

MR. VILE: I would like to bring this out, I think that

Mr. Thomas and I think the commercial industry want to pay a fair share, is that correct, Mr. Thomas?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: That is correct.

MR. VILE: And I am not trying to belittle what they are putting in here, but over a period of time some of these things have slipped by as I pointed out, for instance, in the kelp taxation, that is a number of years old, and I think it ought to be brought up to date with today's economy.

After all, when there is a lot of what you consider necessities of life that you pay taxes on and every once in awhile they raise them because they feel it is necessary, and I certainly don't think they do it because they are trying to impose a burden on us, but I think these taxes should be reviewed from time to time as you do the sportsman's license.

If the sportsman's license is no longer supporting the Department, it is reviewed and you have to give it more money and if this spiral inflation increases, these things are going to have to be done.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, do you have any comment to make on the kelp situation as far as the tax, possible review of the tax increase since they merely bring forth to the benefit of the Fish and Game Department about eight cents on a ton? Do you know about the kelp industry -- how do they feel about this? You can't speak for them, I appreciate that, but what are your feelings on this?

MR. SHANNON: I can't say how the kelp industry would

look toward an increase in taxes. It just happens that last week I went through their plant at San Diego. I never had an opportunity to do that before. They have a tremendous installation there and I was surprised at all the processes they go through to manufacture kelp into the final form which ends up in ice cream, as Mr. Thomas mentioned.

The cost of getting the kelp is only the beginning. They have I don't know how many processes they go through to end up in the final form. I think we should take a look at the situation to see whether or not the tax that the State is getting from kelp is commensurate with the benefit to the industry and we can do that.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Somebody is asking a question of me and frankly I am not aware as to what benefit -- what do they seek from kelp that actually is encouraging to the ice cream manufacturer?

MR. SHANNON: Well, surprisingly, I am not a kelp expert now, I went through the plant in an hour and I was on the run all the time so you can imagine what the size of the plant was.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Does it keep it from crystalizing?

MR. SHANNON: It forms a base for a lot of things. It is used, for instance in ice cream base, it is used in these shortenings as a base and in many other products. I was surprised how many products this is used in. They get a demand or request from a company to provide so much of this material and it has to be manufactured according to specifications in relation to that particular product. So they turn this out for that particular

industry and it is kind of a fibroid, a fiber. I was surprised. I thought it was a gelatinous type of substance, but it is fiber, and they use it in a great many products and in different forms in relation to the particular product.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask the witness a question? I would like to see a review of all of the tax matters on ocean fisheries and also I would like to have a review along with that with your organization of a possible marine fisheries commission, ocean fish commission separate from inland fisheries, and maybe we can make some strides.

Do you know what your organization would think about that?

MR. VILE: They have thought along those lines a good deal, Mr. Thomas, and I think if we were to put together some effort on both our parts, I think it could be accomplished.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I think if you sit down and talk about these things more we would probably come up with some compromise program. I would like to see it.

MR. VILE: I will grant you --

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I don't like to see one segment, the ocean fisheries keep knifing another segment when the ones who are in that business and making a tremendous amount of money, and when I leave the Legislature I would like to go in that business --

MR. VILE: Don't confuse the sports fishing with the people that are operating sports fishing boats, although they have a direct interest.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: A lot of these fellows in your organization, what business are they in?

MR. VILE: My secretary is in the sheet metal business.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Aren't they selling tackle?

MR. VILE: I think you are going back into history.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: And party boats and tackle business and sports shops?

MR. VILE: Last year we had one person sat on the board of directors who operated a boat out of Newport Beach. In order to consolidate our ideas and programs it is necessary to bring the sports fishing people in to understand their problems. However, this person does not sit on the board and at this time there is nobody that is in the tackle business or the sports fishing business that does sit on our board of directors.

These people come from clubs that are affiliated with our organization and they come from all walks of life.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, it is possible what you are asking for, Mr. Thomas, is for the commercial industry to actually get together with these people so that you can start discussing very seriously some of the differences of opinion that you have among yourselves. That is a step in the right direction.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: There are a lot of differences could be settled without coming to the Legislature. You could eliminate sixty percent of the problems in the Legislature by having these caucuses.

MR. VILE: Mr. Thomas, I will take your suggestion and

make an attempt to have a sincere talk with various people and see if we can't accomplish something along that line.

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: There is one question I would like to ask and that is in regard to the hauling of these people out to do their fishing. Do the ones that go out then not have a license?

MR. VILE: The people that do go fishing on the party boats are required to have a license, yes. The people that operate the boats are required to register their boats.

ASSEMBLYMAN BURKE: I see.

MR. VILE: One thing else I would bring out along the taxation line here for a possible source of revenue for the Department of Fish and Game -- now fresh fish in this State are not taxed.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you pardon us?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: May I ask our attorney a question? Do sportsmen get a \$10 license for some of these fish?

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: I would have to check that just a moment.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We are having a subcommittee meeting over here, if you will just pardon us for a moment until we get this question resolved.

MR. VILE: Very good.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: If the angler in your organization is a sportsman and he gets a \$10 license, and if he goes to the market and sells the fish and cuts the price of the commercial

fisherman, I would say the angler should pay a little more, don't you think?

MR. VILE: Granted, I will go right along with you because I frown very deeply on people taking fish under a sports fishing license or riding the sports fishing boats and there are laws that cover this. If they violate the law, then it is up to the enforcement branch to enforce it.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, would you like to make a comment here?

MR. SHANNON: I think it adds up to this, that anybody can buy a commercial fishing license and take fish and sell them for profit. However, an angler who goes out on a sports fishing boat cannot sell those fish. In other words, he is prohibited from selling a fish if he goes out on a sports fishing boat.

That is one of the charter boats that regularly take anglers out, a registered boat, where they take them out for fishing. Is that what you found?

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: Section 7121 of the Fish and Game Code provides that it is unlawful to buy, sell or possess in any place of business where fish are bought, sold or processed, any fish taken on any boat, barge or vessel which carries sports fishermen. As long as these are party boats carrying sports fishermen, they cannot sell fish taken off that. No one.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: If he goes in his own boat, he can do it?

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: In his own boat that is a different

proposition, providing he has a commercial license.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Will you proceed, Mr. Vile?

MR. VILE: That was about all I had to add on the tax on the fresh fish. I think there is a possibility of additional revenue as the fresh fish is in direct competition for many of the species that we seek as recreation. I think they should share the research along this line also as the money taken in from sardines, mackerel, anchovies and tuna are pretty well spent in that field and very little money, probably nothing at all, to be very frank, is spent along the barracuda, white sea bass and halibut and others that are both directly in competition commercially and sports fishing wise.

We had quite a problem in determining, although we feel that the ocean angler is paying his way. The department made the statement they thought they were pretty well paying their way, but we disagree with their 1955 survey and the way they proportioned the money.

We would like to bring this to your attention that in 1955 we had one of the poorest sports fishing years and a few years prior to that was also very poor. Naturally, the fishing falls off as far as the angler is concerned, but we feel that in 1957 the sports fishing began to return in quantities that enticed people to come back down to the ocean and enjoy sports fishing, that the ocean angler has increased by leaps and bounds and this is clearly shown in the \$1 license for the three day permit which has jumped considerably.

I believe the last figure I saw it was up to 86,000 permits -- it was pretty close to the estimated total, 86,000, just for a permit to fish three days out of the year.

Now, we feel that the general license itself should be up in a percentage that is fairly equal to that, and we believe at this time that a new postcard survey should be made to determine the difference in percentages at this time. We also would like to point out the sad water conditions that are developing in Southern California particularly in the Los Angeles area and areas that are along the seacoast.

People are turning from trout fishing now and depending more and more on ocean sports fishing, and I think this situation is going to become even more pertinent as time goes by unless nature makes a sudden change and gives us a good deal of rain. These people are not going to be able to find room to use this as recreation let alone fish in the Los Angeles area.

There won't be enough of it to go around. They are going to have to depend on the ocean. A lot of them have found that by using fresh water tackle in certain areas of our ocean along our breakwaters and along our rocky coast line they are able to derive practically the same type of sport only they catch a little larger fish and some of them have given up trout fishing completely in favor of this type of fishing.

But in the future we look for even a greater pressure on our ocean fisheries by the sportsmen of this State. Los Angeles County is expected to have an additional half a million people in

this coming year. Out of that half million naturally along comes a number of fishermen that are going to seek recreation by fishing.

If they can't find it back in the streams and in the lakes, they are going to find it in the ocean, so this is something that we have to look forward to and try to anticipate and I believe that this marine habitat development program which has been started under the financing of the Dingle-Johnson program and is now being continued under the wildlife conservation board money, is going to be the answer to some of these problems.

I would like to direct your attention to page 163 of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report. This seems to be quite a controversial report when it comes to the figures. I would just like to direct your attention to the figures on marine fish programs, primarily the expenditures and revenue. It gives you an idea of what is being taken in in relation to the different categories of fisheries and what is being paid out.

In many cases such as the pelagic fish program they are spending 8.1 percent of the money and the revenue is only 2.4 percent. In cases like that I feel there are some things that are out of balance here as far as that is concerned and that is why I brought this tax program into this thing here.

In the case of other sports fish, the expenditures are 2.8 percent, the revenue is 4.1 percent, so that gives an inkling there that more money is being spent on what we consider commercial or commercial projects. Although they are for the benefit of the State and the people of the State, they are not the fish that we

are fishing for to catch. They play a very important part. We can't deny that, but if there is no way to determine how this money is to be split up, I don't think unless they sit down and figure out the value received from a fishery or something on that order so that the license money will be appropriated into projects where commercial money is being directed, because it is of importance to the sportsmen.

But on what scale should it be directed to that project and if too much money is directed to any one project of that type, then other projects which are of vital interest to the sportsmen are neglected. We kind of feel that we are on relief in some respects in the marine fishery projects that are what we could consider sportsmen's projects, such as the white sea bass and the barracuda projects.

Now, these projects are carried on under the Dingle-Johnson fund of which the State only provides 25 percent of the money and 75 percent comes from federal revenue where it is collected on tackle. And this has been the case in a number of projects because one project just mentioned, the marine habitat project, that was financed under the Dingle-Johnson and Wildlife Conservation Board money.

The life history of the barred perch, which are primarily a sports fish, was financed under that method. And one thing I am just a little bit concerned about, some of these programs are awfully short range programs. I don't believe -- there are some of them that do not run long enough -- maybe it is a case of

finances again -- to really get a true picture of the thing. However, we intend to go into this further. I think by looking at this Booz, Allen and Hamilton report, it has opened our eyes on a good deal of things and the questions that have been thrown out today, whether you think this survey was a value, in some instances I think it was very good and in others I hesitate on it, but because some of their figures on money are definitely out of line, like the figures based there on one particular year where as I mentioned the sports fishing was terrifically bad and in that year everybody went bottom fishing.

In Southern California we have two types of fishing and about the only time they will bottom fish except for a real select group of people that like that, is the group of people that go there out of desperation. I think the greater majority of people enjoy the surface fishing.

In that year they consigned almost the entire amount of money to bottom fishing projects. Now, this didn't make sense at all. When the money was divided up under the survey made here only \$286,000 was devoted to bottom fishing, so I don't think they knew where they were going when they started with some of these figures, but it did lay down for once a complete file on money.

I think this is very valuable along that line. Maybe they are not exactly accurate, but they are down so we can look them over.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I don't want to place myself in the position where I am defending the analyst that made this report

because I have some differences of opinion on it myself, but nevertheless it has been verified to this committee in writing that the figures they have used -- and they have broken them down and the formulas of course are their own, but they do assure me that the figures are from the Department of Fish and Game, so if there is any difference of opinion with the Department I would like to have them at this time.

MR. SHANNON: Well, there is a difference of opinion, Mrs. Davis. They obtained a lot of figures from us, basic figures, but their interpretation is different than how we would have interpreted them.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You mean there is a difference of interpretation even on the basic figures?

MR. SHANNON: Well, yes, in other words for instance if you look at this same chart here, you can pick out certain figures that perhaps we gave them basic figures, but where you arrive over here in their conclusions and so forth, we don't agree with those.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That I understand. This is the point I wanted to make, that the basic figure they actually achieved from you, but how they arrived at the conclusions was their own determination.

MR. SHANNON: And it was done so without consultation with us.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: As far as the conclusions are concerned?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, and we disagree with many of their conclusions.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is the way the legislation was written and I might say I didn't support it, and that is one of those things.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I would like to ask Mr. Croker a question which might be of some help to Mr. Vile.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Croker.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Mr. Croker, is the dollar tax on every ton of fish that is landed in California?

MR. CROKER: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Then that is on fish from Japan also?

MR. CROKER: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: What percentage of the tuna is actually caught in American waters or any place in American territories?

MR. CROKER: Well, I don't have the figures.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Would you say that 98 percent is imported and caught in Mexico and Peru and Costa Rica?

MR. CROKER: No, I think before answering that question we would have to define what "imported" is.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Anything caught outside of American waters.

MR. CROKER: Our division is those caught by the California fishing fleet as opposed to imports which come in by freighters and are caught by foreign fleets.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: We have those that come from Japan

by steamer and they all pay a dollar, don't they?

MR. CROKER: They all paid that.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: And only five percent is caught in American waters, but they still pay that dollar?

MR. CROKER: The entire --

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I am using the Department's figures. I just wanted to get this into the record. I am trying to help you.

MR. CROKER: Yes, I know you are.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: The Department figures --

MR. CROKER: I can't go along with the five percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, you better check some of your records. I mean caught in American waters, actually caught.

MR. CROKER: Anywhere from 90 to 50 percent of the albacore catch is caught off the United States and that amounts to a fairly good proportion of the catch. Of the blue fin tuna from 50 to 90 percent is caught off the United States each year depending on the migration pattern. The big tuna fish, yellow fin and skip jack are caught off Latin America by California boats. The amount of fish imported from foreign countries and caught by foreign fleets has increased tremendously, so that although the total tuna industry has doubled and quadrupled since the war, a growing percentage or proportion of that total has been caught by foreign fleets so that the figure is now somewhere around -- I don't know -- I am going by memory -- around 40 to 45 percent is now caught by foreign fleets of all the tuna packed in the United

States.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: But all fish imported and caught in foreign water still pays \$1 and doesn't get a benefit at all. That is the point I want to bring out. You consider those factors?

MR. VILE: This brings to mind a question. Madam Chairman, may I direct a question to Mr. Croker? How far from the territorial waters of this State or of this country do you range with your research?

MR. CROKER: Madam Chairman, our research as in any other resource has to be over the same range as the fish itself, so our research is pretty much wherever the fish can be found. Our men and vessels follow the fish fleet.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, it could be a debatable issue.

MR. VILE: Yes, it could.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I am just trying to figure out where the benefits are coming from.

MR. VILE: Well, the sportsmen's take of tuna is minor in this State, yet according to this thing here they contribute \$20,000 a year, estimated \$20,000 to tuna research.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, isn't it very hard -- I want to ask Mr. Shannon, isn't it very hard to determine the revenue on a specific specie? Isn't that a problem for the Department?

MR. SHANNON: That is very difficult and that is where I think the Booz, Allen and Hamilton people ran into trouble when they got into species, because as was illustrated yesterday, if a

fellow went out, he may have the same reason for going out, hunting or fishing, but if he gets something then they charge his license as revenue and if he didn't get anything then they didn't charge his license as revenue. It went to something else.

The same thing is true here. When you get into species it is very hard to determine how much revenue a particular species brings in. I might say at this time, and this applies to all people who have testified here, we would like to have copies of their presentations pending the time that the transcript is made up because we feel there are lots of valuable suggestions and some of them have already submitted them to us, and Bob here has always been constructive in his analysis of the Department's affairs and so forth, and if he has a copy of his presentation, we would like to have it for consideration of his suggestions.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, just in case he doesn't have one, I don't know whether you have or not, Mr. Vile -- do you have one?

MR. VILE: I have a list of notes. I have often found in talking before committees they get awfully bored with a long list of prepared statements and I always found they are interested in questions, and by the time you are through you have answered their questions. And they know more about what you are trying to say.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I might say to you, Mr. Shannon, I will be most happy to submit to you a copy of the transcript when it is made up so you will have all the information relative to his presentation.

MR. SHANNON: Thank you.

MR. VILE: I would like to speak on one more thing here. When your letter came out you were going to have this meeting and wanted us to review more or less the budget, we made it a point to go to Terminal Island, which is the headquarters for the marine resources operation and to go over the personnel that are there, more or less you might say that they do not actually produce anything but facts and figures at Terminal Island, but we went over the personnel and asked questions as to what type of work this person was doing and that person and how many people were assigned to this type of work and the other, and we do not feel that there is any waste of funds in this case.

In fact, you might say it is a little embarrassing. We went down to pick up some pictures for some of our publications and we found a picture of the manager of the Terminal Island branch out pulling beach seines along with the same people who were doing the work on the survey, so apparently he had to pitch in to help, and I know that is the case.

There is a lot of work that goes on there where one biologist has got to go over and help another go through a program and the thing is vice versa, and I don't think there is any wasted motion down there at all.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: As Chairman voicing my own feelings I congratulate you. After you received this report of ours which I might say was quite an effort because we had to obtain these figures from the Department of Finance, and of course they were

the Departments figures, but in order to actually place them in a form where anyone could understand them, because figures are always dry when you try to analyze them, but you did make a serious effort to find out as far as your association was concerned whether or not the expenditure was justifiable, and I want to compliment you because certainly we didn't come here to put on a show for anybody.

It is a real serious situation as far as I was concerned and I think it is really a compliment to your organization to go into this.

MR. VILE: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: You gave a good presentation, too, Bob.

MR. VILE: Thank you. I would like to talk if I may, just a few minutes on conservation education because Mr. Thomas has directed a question to one witness here which I would like to take on in this form.

Mr. Thomas, we have taken it upon ourselves, we of the Ocean Fishery Protective Association, to start a little conservation education on our own and while I was sitting back in the audience I noticed one member of the committee up here has a copy of that paper which contains four pages, and I am sure he will share it with you, or I think we have some with us and I would like to have you see it.

We have devoted a picture page to some of the research that is being done and feeling that facts and figures do not

attract the general public, we are using pictures and a layman's explanation of what is being done. This is going to be done every month in our publication along with disseminating the news of our organization meetings and such, and we feel that we will be doing our part.

I think conservation education within the Department is a real problem because it is a problem to just get to such a mass of people and, as I said, it is awfully dry when you come down to it. Unless you are directly interested like I am and you are, there are a lot of sportsmen that really delve into this stuff and are very interested. I can't say it is wasted. It is good material and I know we receive Outdoor California and most of the boards of directors receive Outdoor California and we also receive the fishery bulletins with all the scientific information and we do receive quite a few publications.

At times we have been displeased with some articles that appeared in Outdoor California, but I think we resolved this problem with the Department and found that people are hungry for this type of information and that is why we built our paper around it.

We found that when we had an open house at Terminal Island in cooperation with the Department of Fish and Game and invited our people from our clubs down there to see what work was being done with their license dollar, we got a better turnout than we ever expected. We had a terrific turnout and the people were really enthusiastic to see what was being done in their

interest with their license dollar.

If a person doesn't see where his money is being spent in a wise manner it is very difficult to get any more money from him. If he is educated to see that his program is being handled in a wise manner and there does come a time when there is a need for more money, he is going to be willing to give it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: How do you finance that?

MR. VILE: The paper is financed by ads. I would like to point out, however, we don't have to solicit the ads. We have to build the circulation. One more thing, Madam Chairman. I let these things slip away from me.

Mr. Thomas asked several of the witnesses if they had taken action on this Booz, Allen and Hamilton report. I would like for the information of the committee to say that we did take action on a section of this report before the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources on seven points of reorganization.

I doubt if our organization will ever take action on the entire thing. I can state here that we are happy with some aspects of it. Some of them, we are not, but no doubt no matter how varied or how good it was or how much money is spent, somebody is going to find some fault with it.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you today and I will look forward to meeting with this group again.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much. Our next witness is Edmund Kohlhauf representing the Golden Gate Sports Fishers. Before you proceed with your testimony, sir, and take your oath

of office, Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Madam Chairman, am I in order now to make a motion on something that is not related to fishing? I would like to do it because of the fact I feel that some of the members of the committee are going to be having to leave.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right. Proceed.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: First, I will state my motion. "I move that the Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game create a citizens' advisory committee on big game to which the Chairman of the Interim Committee is authorized to make appointments that will provide a representative cross section of sportsmen's groups and of state and federal agencies having a mutual interest in the management of California deer herds.

This citizens' advisory committee on big game shall meet at its discretion and shall report its opinions and recommendations on big game management to the Interim Committee on Fish and Game sometime prior to the 1961 General Session of the Legislature."

If I can have a second to that --

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: I will second it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: As most of us of the committee are aware some members of the committee have engaged in several rather extensive field trips in the northern part of the State at the insistence of certain sportsmen's groups for the purpose of examining the conditions of the deer herd, the condition of the range and one thing and another. Now, as I say, there have

been several members that have gone on these trips. We have traveled all over the northern part of the State and while I wouldn't say that all of the conclusions that were presented to us or all the representations that were made to us were at variance with the facts, I nevertheless feel that at different times you could have drawn different conclusions and at different places.

There certainly is one thing that was developed and that is that there is an extreme lack of agreement among the various sportsmen's groups as to the validity of the policies that have been followed in connection with deer management in the past few years, and it occurs to me that rather than have the committee continue this field trip process which is rather expensive and which involves a considerable amount of time and effort on the part of the members, that it would be more to the point if we could have what would represent a consolidated view from the sportsmen's groups throughout the State, not necessarily in the areas involved where the deer are, but where the sportsmen's groups are and it would be of considerable help to us if we had a unified opinion from these various sportsmen's groups, and this is the purpose of my motion.

I would think that if the committee would approve it, that by 1961 at least we would have the sportsmen in agreement on this problem or at least getting closer to agreement.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: What is the wish of the committee?
Is there any objection?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: John, do you think you can get a unified opinion?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: Well, let's say we might be able to get an overwhelming majority report. I think that generally we could. Certainly we would have much more basis for it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: What if the report comes in with a bare majority, would the committee here have to accept it or just take it under advisement?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: I think the committee would have to take it for what it is and act on it accordingly.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We can either accept it or reject it. We are not compelled to say that we are going to accept it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Are the sportsmen for this?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: I think most of the sportsmen would be in agreement with this.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I at this time for clarification ask Mr. De Chambeau on the legality. These people would serve without compensation. Isn't this somewhat similar to a commercial fishery and sports fishery group that was formulated a year or so ago? Would you explain that, Mr. De Chambeau?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I think that lasted two years.

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: It is at the discretion of the committee to use any of these aids that they desire. These committees have no official status. That is, neither their actions nor their recommendations are binding on this committee, but this committee may, if it desires, appoint such committees to aid in

its deliberations as it sees fit.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And they also have the opportunity of requesting the Department officials to assist them as far as technical advice only, is that my understanding?

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: That would be at the discretion of the committee. Their actions are only binding to the extent the committee acts itself. The committee may instruct the Department to cooperate with them as they would with the committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: You mean the committee would tell the Department what they would do?

MR. DE CHAMBEAU: You mean this advisory group? No more so than this committee itself. They would have no power that this committee has. Obviously, this committee works by cooperation with the Department and that would be the same arrangement.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: If there are no objections, then -- is there anyone in the audience -- perhaps we should ask if there is anyone in the audience in opposition to an advisory committee of this kind that would represent a statewide representation on the committee? Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: No, we certainly have no opposition and if you appoint such a committee we will be happy to cooperate as much as we can to furnish information and anything they want.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All those in favor say aye.

(Thereupon the motion was voted on.)

The motion is carried. Now, if you will proceed, please, and you will take the oath.

(Thereupon Mr. Kohlhauf was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

MR. KOHLHAUF: I have here six copies of the presentation which I would present to the committee if you so wish.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I may say at this time I will have the Sergeant at Arms pass around a slip in the audience and those of you who wish to say something before we finish can sign one of these slips so we don't overlook anyone.

MR. KOHLHAUF: Mrs. Davis, and members of the committee, my name is Edmund Kohlhauf, representing the Golden Gate Sports Fishers.

I would like to say here now that we differ possibly from most of the organizations on the license fee structure and so we make our presentation. In other phases of the hearing we would like to concur with the Associated Sportsmen of California.

The Golden Gate Sports Fishers feel that an increase in license fees for sports fishing is inevitable to enable the Department of Fish and Game to provide the services asked for by the license buyer. We hardly are in a position to judge just what the amount of this fee should be; nor can we leave it up to the license buyer by asking him what he wants to pay.

Rather the Legislature should determine what is necessary in license fees to keep the various fisheries in good condition. To this end we hope the following suggestions will be of help to this committee in their determination.

In 1928 the fishing license has been increased from

\$1 to \$2. Also in 1928 the average weekly wage of the production worker was \$29.24.

In 1959 the average weekly wage of the production worker was \$102, better than three times the amount he received in 1928. Therefore he also should be able to afford three times as much for his fishing license, which would be \$6. Whatever amount is determined for the fishing license, this amount should be uniform for the following reasons:

- a. This would be the most economic and efficient way.
- b. The majority of license buyers fish for more than one group of fish.
- c. All fisheries need extensive research in the near future, partly to offset losses incidental to the march of progress, partly with a view of finding ways to enhance fisheries to provide sport for the ever increasing population of the State of California.

Should it be desired to break up the license fee into different groups we would like to recommend a basic license fee of \$4 and stamp in the amount of 50 cents each to be attached to the license for each of the following groups: (1) ocean fish; (2) stripped bass and fresh water fish; (3) trout and (4) steelhead and salmon -- each stamp to be easily distinguishable from each other.

If no change of the present setup in license fees is contemplated, the \$1 stamp now required to take salmon in fresh water should also apply to this specie in salt waters.

I believe that this has been overlooked in the 1957 increase in license fees in which we said nothing should be added to the ocean fishery, but certainly the salmon should have had a dollar added in addition to pay for the research that is necessary.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by the members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Might I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Thomas, would you take the chair for awhile?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: You say it should be \$6?

MR. KOHLHAUF: I said according to the wages which have increased three times since 1928 until 1958, according to that increase, he could afford today \$6 for a license. I say the legislators should determine what is necessary in the amount of a license.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Do you know the cost of living has gone up and you are asking us to increase this thing right now when it is not necessary? You say we should do this this year?

MR. KOHLHAUF: Well, I don't know if it is necessary or not. That is something to determine. In my meetings, and there are many of them, the first question we ask, we would like to have this or that done and the first answer we get is we do not have finances or manpower in the Department to do it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, wouldn't you eliminate a lot of people from going fishing if you put it up to \$6? I wouldn't

pay \$6.

MR. KOHLHAUF: Well, let's say it this way, that with no fish in the pond it will eliminate more fishing than anything else. I believe that much. \$2 spent by the sportsmen for the license will put more fish in his bag than the rest of the money that is spent all year long.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: So the only thing your organization is asking is an increase in the fees then, as I see it?

MR. KOHLHAUF: It is a suggestion. We figure it could possibly pay that much. But I still say it is not up to us to say what they should pay. It is up to the Legislature to determine what fee is necessary to keep the fisheries in good condition because if you ask the fishermen, and lots of them come to me, they don't want to pay anything in a license fee to take fish. They would rather have the State provide them.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: All I have heard all the way along the line is they want these programs, they want more over the rod catching. They want more shooting. They want it all and they are willing to pay for it. As far as I can make out, everybody wants to pay more for it and they want the programs to keep going. They want to make it bigger and spend more money. That seems to be the thing I have heard here. That is the will of the people and that is it.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Well, I haven't heard anybody -- you are the first one that has come up with this kind of program.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: You have heard it -- we have heard

it now for two days. They are willing to spend more money as long as they get animals to shoot and more birds to shoot and more fish to catch. That is the answer.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: We don't have to increase it as far as I am concerned. You don't have to increase it for a couple of years. You still have some money and the program is coming along fine.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: That isn't what they have been saying. They want more. If they want more, let's give it to them and make them pay for it. What is wrong with it?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: There is no use asking the Department on this. Well, I don't know. Any questions from the committee? Let me ask you, does your organization feel that the Department is doing a good job? Are they satisfied with the programs that are outlined by the Department?

MR. KOHLHAUF: Not all of them are satisfied, but the majority are. We figure on keeping after them to be satisfied.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: What species of fish do most of your people catch?

MR. KOHLHAUF: My organization is interested mostly in salmon. That is why we said we support the Organized Sportsmen, especially interested in salmon, and I believe it was an oversight that no stamp was attached to the salmon catch in ocean waters. I would like to say here that -- I beg your pardon. I lost the thought.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: What was that?

MR. KOHLHAUF: I lost what I wanted to say. Oh yes, I come back to it now.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: I have no questions. I made up my mind they want more money and more birds and everything.

MR. KOHLHAUF: Our basic recommendation would be that the license fees should be one license and they can fish in the State of California in the water and take whatever fish are available. We believe, and I hope that sometime in the future the fishing, sport fishing fraternity will work as a team rather than bicker over a one or two dollar stamp here or there. I hope they will shoulder the responsibility and provide the Department with enough money to give them what they ask for.

At times it is necessary to put a little more money into one program and at other times it is necessary to put it into another program, and I believe \$2 is hardly enough to squabble about. I believe the sportsmen should band together and help each other. That is all I have.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: It is pretty good testimony, I guess. The next witness is Mr. Fisher of the Superior California Wildlife Federation.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: At this time we will take a brief recess.

(Thereupon a short recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Fisher, I believe you are the next witness.

(Thereupon Mr. Fisher was duly and regularly sworn by

Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Please be seated and proceed.

MR. FISHER: Well, Madam Chairman and members of the committee and ladies and gentlemen, I represent the Superior California Wildlife Federation and I haven't any formal presentation to make at this time. Due to the time, at the present time a lot of the things that I would have to say would be a duplication of what has already gone today and yesterday, so in order to cut down the time why I am going to just mention a couple of points.

We certainly haven't any quarrel with the Department as far as their policies **are** concerned and we are very happy to learn that the pheasant farm program is going to continue to furnish young birds to the sportsmen's pens. The clubs in our area, Sacramento, Yolo and Solano and part of Sutter County, are very much interested in this because they have a lot of money tied up in pheasant pens which they have built over the years and gone along with the Department following the program and trying to assist them and it would be pretty hard to dispose of these pens at the present time.

Now, one point that I think has been mentioned already that I would like to clarify -- somebody mentioned the fact that the sportsmen are using these birds for their own private shooting. Due to the number of game bird clubs in our area it has been forced upon us to try to find some local areas for our local people to shoot on and for that reason why we have

planted birds on areas set aside.

Now, as you well know, all of the pheasant country is privately owned and none of it is public property to speak of at all. Well, therefore, these people that own that property surely have a right to say something about what is going to be done on it and how it is going to be managed.

We have entered into some agreement with the farmers in our area. We have a fairly good farmer-sportsmen's relation and we have such a shooting area.

Another thing we have noticed too, it has been very difficult in some highly cultivated areas where row crops are raised to obtain areas for the planting of pheasants. A lot of these farmers don't want pheasants planted where they are raising row crops, and I think the Department well recognizes that fact and the sportsmen in the local areas also.

The commercial game bird clubs are causing quite a little problem and I am going to tell you what this is, which is not my own particular opinion, but is the opinion that has come to me through some of the clubs that operate large shooting areas on a cost basis, and at the present time these game bird clubs are located on practically the best wild cover in the area and due to the long shooting season that they have they are the beneficiaries of the wild pheasant.

Another thing, too, I believe that it is generally conceded that they buy mostly mongolian pheasants which are birds that do not survive very well in the rice country and for that

reason why a lot of the wild birds that are shot are shot on these wild game bird clubs.

I think the Hart Report will bear this out. The activities of the clubs is something like this. They are located on the best cover that there is in the area, wild cover for birds, but if they have any dog training to do, the dogs are usually trained outside of the game bird clubs. This has a tendency to drive birds into the club all the time and it isn't really necessary for them to plant as many birds as they would otherwise.

The only reason they plant the birds is to get the shooting privileges. In other words, they get, I believe, seventy percent of the birds -- they are allowed to shoot seventy percent of the birds that are planted. I don't think I have anything else as far as that is concerned. Everything else would be a duplication of what has already gone on.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I see. Is your Association in favor of the recommendation that is being made on the trout program to the Fish and Game Commission?

MR. FISHER: Well, they probably would like to see the catchable trout program pay its own way. In other words, they don't believe that the catchable trout should be planted in waters heavily infested with rough fish.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: They feel then that there needs to be more concentration on the elimination of rough fish before these areas are planted?

MR. FISHER: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I am sure that you are acquainted with the specie of pheasant that the Department tries to enhance in the State of California. Do you feel that that is the best specie of pheasant that can be used as far as the roughness of the individual pheasant is concerned, or do you think there is another specie that they might consider?

MR. FISHER: No, the ring neck pheasant I think is the one that is most adaptable to our area and not the mongolian. Mongolian pheasants are raised by the domestic game breeders because they develop quickly. They are a larger bird and they are probably more easily sold to the game bird clubs on that account.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by members of the committee? May I ask you before you leave, I understand -- is there a Northern California Wildlife Federation being formed, or a branch of the California Wildlife Federation -- is that in process at this particular time?

MR. FISHER: I believe it has been given some thought, but it isn't in process right at the present time. There has been a meeting or two, and nothing concrete has been done at the present time that I know of.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I see. Thank you very much. Does the Department have any comments to make on Mr. Fisher's statement?

MR. SHANNON: No, we don't.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Fisher.

MR. FISHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, our next witness is Mr. Burt Banzhaf, President of the Ukiah Rod and Gun Club.

(Whereupon Mr. Banzhaf was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Be seated and proceed. May I ask you at this time what council is your gun club associated with?

MR. BANZHAF: We are affiliated with the California Wildlife Federation and also the Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, will you proceed?

MR. BANZHAF: I have a prepared statement which I would ask the hearing Sergeant at Arms to pass out to the press.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Sergeant at Arms, would you be so kind as to pass out the statement the gentleman has?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: While they are passing this out, I notice there are fifteen different sportsmen's groups that are all affiliated with one another.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, they belong to different sports groups, they belong to councils and those councils, some of them do belong to the California Wildlife Federation, but not all of them.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: Fifteen different organizations. They are not interwoven together.

MR. BANZHAF: Are you asking me, sir?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS: I notice we have fifteen different

conservation clubs and wildlife federations. Is there a parent organization?

MR. BANZHAF: Not to my knowledge, no. As I get on into this report I will explain to you why we are here representing an individual club even though we belong to an affiliation that was here at this hearing prior to us.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Do you all talk to each other?

MR. BANZHAF: Sometimes, yes. Chairman Davis and committee members, ladies and gentlemen, the statement on behalf of the Ukiah Rod and Gun Club is as follows. I am one of the representatives of the Ukiah Rod and Gun Club. My name is Burton Banzhaf. I am the past president of the club, having served in that capacity in 1959. Mr. Jack Mitchell, a director of the California Wildlife Federation, who is here with me today, is also representing our club.

We understand that the purpose of this hearing is to examine the cost of the fish and game program, and in particular to determine whether the sportsmen believe that the revenue for operation of the Department should be increased with a consequent increase in license fees, or whether the services of the Department should be limited by the amount of revenue available at the present cost of licenses.

We do not believe that any worthwhile program of the Department should be curtailed for lack of revenue merely because it would involve an increase in the cost of licenses. From the information available to us, it is our belief that the program

presently being carried on by the Department does not warrant an increase in the departmental budget at this time.

From our study of the cost of operation of the Department of Fish and Game we note the following:

a. The raised trout program costs amount to almost two million dollars, while the revenue from licenses to support the programs produced roughly \$700,000, thus a deficit.

b. The raised pheasant program costs in excess of a half million dollars, and the income supporting the program is approximately \$100,000, again a deficit.

c. The game management program in the five regions costs in excess of \$600,000 in salaries alone according to our understanding of the 1959-60 budget. The revenue produced from this phase of the program we presume would be offset by the hunting licenses sold.

We have mentioned these three items from the budget to illustrate our position with reference to this matter. We are of the opinion that the Department is spending too much money on the artificial propagation of trout and pheasants. We are opposed to the continuance of these programs at the expense of the sportsmen of the State.

If the raised trout program and the pheasant program are to be continued, we believe that the cost of those programs should be limited by the income realized from licenses sold to support the same. We are opposed to the continuance of these programs so long as they operate in the red.

We feel there is too much emphasis placed upon the artificial propagation programs and not enough emphasis upon the improvement of the natural habitat of fish and game. There is a great need for more work on stream clearance and improvement, and need for an improved controlled burning program.

Both of these projects will, in our opinion, lead to an increase in migratory fish and in an improved range for our deer herds.

The artificial propagation programs have no permanent long range effect on trout fishing or pheasant hunting, carried on as they are on a "put and take" basis. The sportsmen and land owners in the area represented by our club are not in accord with some of the policies advocated by the Department, in particular they are opposed to the Department's policy on antlerless deer hunting.

We believe that the Department is spending too much money in an attempt to convince the people that antlerless deer hunting will benefit the deer herds in our area and not enough time and money in the improvement to the natural habitat of our herds.

For example, the Department spends for publications some \$114,000 annually. Some of this cost, it is true, is for printing laws and regulations, but a substantial portion of this sum is devoted to publication of Outdoor California and technical reports. And at this time I would like to deviate from the printed copy here to say that we feel that the Outdoor California

although it is supposed to represent or be the magazine of the sportsmen of the State, we have not been able to get anything published in that magazine that is contrary to the policies of the Department.

In other words, we feel that it is totally one-sided.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Will you state that again? In other words, have you ever conferred with the Department as to another philosophy that the sportsmen organizations may have, and are you saying that they have refused to print it in their Outdoor California?

MR. BANZHAF: I would like Mr. Mitchell to come up here at this time.

(Thereupon Mr. Mitchell was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Be seated. Did you hear my question, sir?

MR. MITCHELL: Will you repeat it again, please?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Have you at any time proposed a different policy on any program on fish and game to the Department requesting that it be printed in Outdoor California and has the Department refused to do so?

MR. MITCHELL: I wrote a letter here about last November I think it was, to the then director of the Department of Fish and Game criticizing some of the things that were going on in the Department, some of the publications. I challenged him to print that in the Outdoor California and it has not to

my knowledge appeared.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And was it pertaining to the printed material that they distribute or was it on policy, on a phase of the fish and game program?

MR. MITCHELL: It was mostly, partly on the policy and partly on some of the articles printed therein.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Did you receive an acknowledgement from Mr. Warne at that time to your correspondence?

MR. MITCHELL: No, I did not.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You did not.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Madam Chairman, I would like to know -- of course, you know all newspapers print letters and they don't print a lot of letters that come in. What is your policy, do you print all letters or only certain letters or letters of praise or what is the editorial policy on these letters like a letter from you?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, Mr. Shannon, would you answer that question keeping in mind, of course, at all times that the Department does belong to the licensed buyer.

MR. SHANNON: We don't run a letters to the editor column if that is what you mean. I would like to ask Mr. Mitchell or Mr. Banzhaf whether either one of them ever submitted an article for publication to Outdoor California?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You gentlemen heard the question. Do you have an answer?

MR. MITCHELL: No, I have never submitted, but I have

suggested a time or two that we get some work done through the boys in the field up there on two projects, one the rescue of fish below Coyote Valley Dam, the other the six miles of fence which were built Scotts Valley in Lake County to stop the deer from doing the plant depredation in the valley, Scotts Valley.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Was that requesting that your opinion on this matter be publicized in Outdoor California, or was that a request to go into the enhancement of the philosophy that you had in these particular instances? Which was it, was it for publication or otherwise?

MR. MITCHELL: We wished to show what we had done in our area towards conservation.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You asked it to be publicized in Outdoor California?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: And what was your answer to that?

MR. MITCHELL: They refused to do anything with it as far as I know.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Do you have a copy of that?

MR. SHANNON: I would like to say this, we have never to my knowledge and if I am wrong I would like to be corrected, we have never received any article from either one of these gentlemen for publication in Outdoor California relating to these two subjects. Now, one of them was the trapping of fish below Coyote Dam and at that time we covered this activity, made releases to the local newspapers which covered the activity

of the group. We didn't publish it in Outdoor California at that time for certain reasons -- we had no article written up on it.

There was newspaper coverage of that particular thing. Now, as far as these two things, if these two gentlemen feel they are worthwhile, we think they have some good points. If they would like to submit an article having to do with what they have done over there, we would be happy to take them under consideration. However, we don't want to get into a fight in Outdoor California with the letters to the editor type of situation. That is not quite the purpose of our magazine.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, will you explain the real purpose of your magazine? I think that will clarify and clear the air a little bit.

MR. SHANNON: Well, the purpose of the magazine is to convey to the people of the State who are interested in conservation of wildlife resources, what the Department is doing, what the programs and policies are, what other agencies and states feel in relation to similar projects.

We do print things that are not always in accordance with our policy. We print some things that we don't entirely agree with, but which give a different slant on approaches to conservation problems.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Does that answer the question for you two gentlemen?

MR. MITCHELL: Not quite.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All right, will you proceed then?

MR. MITCHELL: I have an article here in the September issue, 1959, of the Outdoor California. It is written by Dick Highland, I believe, in the Los Angeles Times, June, 1923, I mean June 23, 1959, speaking on this deer management problem. I would like to read to you three paragraphs.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Would you speak directly into the microphone?

MR. MITCHELL: These three paragraphs -- one position will be that the soft hearted, perhaps soft headed and certainly the misguided individual who fell in love with Walt Disney's Bambi abhors the shooting of such wonderful creatures as deer; the second position will be that of the self centered lad probably with a stout economic interest in the particular area who thinks mainly of the potential dollars brought into the pockets of those of his ~~friends~~ by others.

Each will, of course, rationalize his position to the best of his or her ability. Each will be wrong as wrong can be. Neither the soft hearted sentimentalist nor the hard fisted economist should carry an ounce of weight in the decisions involving deer harvesting.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I recall reading that article in Outdoor California and frankly, I might say from my own personal opinion I knew why the Department conceded to print it because they are trying to sell their deer management programs, whether you agree or disagree with it. This was objected to, was it?

MR. MITCHELL: We objected when we couldn't get anything

from us -- the fact that we in Northern California are bitter against the legalizing of the doe deer.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I see. Mr. Shannon, if these gentlemen should write an article to you stressing their policy and their feeling against your antlerless deer program, would you object to printing it in Outdoor California so their point of view can also be read by the readers of this State?

MR. SHANNON: We will be glad to print it if it is suitable for publication and it doesn't deal in personalities. If it is written in accordance with the way such articles should be, we will be glad to print it.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: When you say "should be", just so they are not dealing with personalities?

MR. SHANNON: Not dealing with personalities, and I mean in the form that we don't have to completely rewrite the thing.

ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Madam Chairman, just let me edit it and it will be all right.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: No, I am just afraid they would probably cut the entire thing out.

MR. SHANNON: That is exactly what we don't want to do. I say written in such form that it would be in a form to be printed.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask you two gentlemen if you proceed to do this, when you send a copy of that to Mr. Shannon, would you also send a copy of it to me?

MR. MITCHELL: Be glad to.

MR. BANZHAF: In these latter publications the Department devotes much time and effort in an attempt to influence the land owners and sportsmen to accept the Department policies on such matters as antlerless deer hunting.

In conclusion, we are in favor of a budget for the Department based upon less service to the sportsmen, especially as it pertains to the artificial propagation program, and more attention directed toward the improvement of the habitat of both fish and game.

Now, this concludes our prepared statement. However, after listening to the testimony and questions during yesterday's session and today, I would like to add a few remarks.

First, you are probably wondering why a club with a membership of 800, the Ukiah Rod and Gun Club, should send us to testify especially considering the fact we are members of both the Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire and the California Wildlife Federation who have testified before us.

It is the feeling of our membership that as we become associated with larger groups we lose our individual identity. Our individual members' views are lost in the shuffle of the larger groups. So individuals having a voice in policy try to tone down individual thinking because of personal aims and desires.

We of the Ukiah Rod and Gun Club have no one in our club with political aims and ambitions and therefore we are

voicing the sentiment of the area, the majority of the area we represent. One of the questions asked several times yesterday was, is the Department doing a good job? Our answer is no. One of the reasons for this is that our club is dissatisfied with the major policies of the Department in regard to their so-called big game management program.

It is our feeling that we have the same policy today as we had under Mr. Gordon. We will continue to bitterly oppose the doe hunt until such time as the public lands are improved to carry the fullest deer herd capacity. We believe we should manage the lands to fit the herd, not so-called manage the herd to fit the land.

If additional funds are necessary to support this land management project, I am sure the sportsmen in our area at least would be willing to bear their share of the financial burden. However, it is our opinion that a great amount of money is now being used in the so-called deer management program that could be transferred to the land management program.

Another question was, have you studied the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report? My answer is, yes, we have studied the condensed version of this report. Our club, however, does not feel that it is totally unbiased. At the time the Booz, Allen and Hamilton representative came to Ukiah, he was escorted by a member of the Department of Fish and Game. We had no prior knowledge that this man was coming. I personally was

called in the early afternoon at my place of business to report at a motel room to answer some questions. I had no time to prepare any constructive criticisms or suggestions.

Our club was in favor of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report being made, and we are very pleased that we have had a chance to follow through on with today's session.

I might say that that gentleman that came there was only interested in big game management and those questions that he asked us were along that line.

In closing I would like to mention that Mendocino and Lake Counties will have a predatory animal problem. In Mendocino County alone our supervisors supply almost \$30,000 per year towards predatory animal control. This amount is hardly enough to care for the problems of our livestock people. It is the opinion of the livestock men and the sportsmen that the public lands offer an inexhaustable supply of predators coming out of these lands into the livestock range.

No matter what the Department of Fish and Game says, our sportsmen believe that the predators are definitely a problem to our wild life. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions of the gentleman? Mr. Shannon, do you have any comments to make?

MR. SHANNON: No, I don't want to get into an argument about antlerless deer hunting here. We realize a lot of people have different ideas throughout the State. We don't propose to try to jam this down their throats and make them

accept it. We think over a period of time they will, maybe some people never will accept it. However, we are proceeding on the basis of scientific management of our deer herds and we are going to try to do this in the best public relations area that we can without trying to get everybody excited over it and we don't propose to try to, you might say, ram this down people's throats.

We are going to say what we think in relation to scientific management of the deer herds and we know some people won't accept it.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: May I ask you a question along this line? Do you feel it is necessary in the big game management area which takes in more than deer, that you need 52 unit game managers? Probably Mr. Glading can answer that.

MR. SHANNON: I don't think we have 52 unit managers.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: That is what we have according to the figures we obtained from the Department of Fish which are your figures -- 52 unit managers.

MR. SHANNON: We may have 52 employed in big game work in the units.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, will you answer, Mr. Glading?

MR. GLADING: Mrs. Davis, I am speaking from memory now, but I can assure the committee that it is not in excess of 40. The figure that sticks in my mind is 36 or 37. Now, the State is divided into 36 or 37 game management units. These people in addition to deer have the responsibility for the

management of other species of game.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I realize that.

MR. GLADING: It is entirely true that for awhile the emphasis perhaps has been a little heavy toward deer management. I think this is only natural. Probably the passage of the Bush bill and the necessity of getting reports up for the Legislature and the Commission probably led to a little over-emphasis of the programming of these men's time, but I want to assure the committee that we are examining the program of these men's time and we are sincerely endeavoring to channel their time into such things as habitat improvement for game and to working with the farmers along the lines that have been suggested many times here today, in order to see that some of these things such as pheasant management, quail management, habitat improvement, and things along those lines receive a balanced attention.

We feel as do perhaps some other people, that there was for a time at least, a disproportionate amount of these men's time spent on deer management. I want to assure you that there are steps being taken right now to bring a more balanced approach into this program.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Glading, may I ask you, some of us went on a deer count actually with your people out in the field, and we studied in detail the different analysis and the charts that they used and sent into the regional office and then that is supposedly to be mailed into the Sacramento

headquarters office. What reception or what attention is actually placed on the reports that are submitted to you? Are you sure that all of them come from the regional office to the Sacramento headquarters office?

MR. GLADING: I certainly hope so, but I can't give you any assurance that each and every one from the 36 or 37 come in. I can perhaps clarify that by outlining the process that we have for getting this data up.

This data all culminates in an annual report that is given to the Commission at their May meeting. It was actually put out prior to the May meeting for the Commission's consideration. There is a very definite program wherein these unit management reports come to headquarters through the regional offices.

They are, you might call them, filtered and in some instances edited at the regional office.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: ~~What~~ type of editing? Why would they have to be edited if the man out in the field actually made this report? Why does it require editing in the regional office? As a matter of fact, even some of the unit game managers are wondering if their reports as they make them originally ever reach Sacramento.

MR. SHANNON: Well, Mrs. Davis, at one time I looked into this and I had a big stack of material that had been submitted by the unit managers, and all the basic material is there. Now, we have to, according to law submit a report under

the Bush bill, and that has to be consolidated -- these reports-- and we have to arrive at the same type of format, so the type of editing that goes on is the type that brings all this information together and puts it in a common form or format for the Bush bill report.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, that doesn't happen at the regional headquarters, does it? That would happen here in Sacramento wouldn't it?

MR. SHANNON: The regional people look it over and submit the report and then it comes here, but I am confident that we get all the basic information. In other words, to begin with, just to give a little background here, we tell them-- we set up guide lines as to the type of information we want in relation to the Bush bill report. And this would be the things that are most appropriate to the management of the deer herds and for the information of the public.

So they follow these guide lines in developing this information and they submit it along those lines and then when it comes in it is only edited to the extent to bring it in line with the over-all format. And I am confident that we get basic information.

In other words, we know in each unit whether or not the range is being over-browsed. We know what the deer population is approximately, whether it is high or low, and in accordance with the range.

We know what happened to the population in relation

to weather conditions, and what happened in relation to previous hunts that might have been held, either buck hunts or either sex hunts.

We know also what the general public attitude in the area is, and that is one of the things they report on whether the people like either sex hunts or whether they don't.

And we have a lot of basic information like that that I am sure comes all the way up from the lowest level.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Now, here is the point that came into the minds of some of the members when we were on this deer count, and I might say it was real cold, 4:30 in the morning, but nevertheless we were wondering why it is necessary, why couldn't the unit game manager send his report directly in to the Sacramento headquarters? Why does it have to go through the regional office and have clerical help there to retype this chart and then mail it on to the Sacramento office?

MR. SHANNON: Many times, Mrs. Davis, the field man writes it out in longhand. Many times it is in longhand and it is in various forms. Also at the regional headquarters, the law enforcement people are consulted on the ground and their comments are entered into the record as to what they think about any proposed hunt that may be suggested there.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You mean the law enforcement people actually make comment on this information according to the deer population on that draft before it comes to Sacramento?

MR. SHANNON: Yes, we get comments from the law

enforcement people on any proposals or what the situation is in relation to the deer in the particular units, and we have tried to make the unit managers' boundaries the same as the law enforcement boundaries so this has been a recent development so that these people are more or less dealing with one another rather than one warden dealing with three or four unit managers.

He is dealing with one and possibly two in some cases. We try to tie those boundaries in together to make for better coordination.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, couldn't the warden still make a recommendation on this analysis directly to the headquarters office?

MR. SHANNON: Well, here we get into a problem of organization and channels.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, this is my concern. I see some duplication here and not only in this case, but in some other cases. I don't mean to be critical. I am just wondering how much a license buyer can afford.

MR. SHANNON: It isn't duplication. It is the normal channel of business. One of the fundamental principles of organization is that you don't circumvent your supervisors and the supervisor doesn't circumvent the people under him, too.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Maybe we have too many supervisors.

MR. SHANNON: We can argue that out. That is a different subject. If you want to go into that, Booz, Allen

and Hamilton suggested cutting down the number of supervisors and I can show you where they haven't cut down any. If anything, they have added some.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I am not for that certain portion of the report.

MR. SHANNON: So if I am a captain out in the field and my wardens are submitting reports, as a supervisor, I feel they should be submitted through me, and I think you will find that anywhere if a man is supervising a group of employees, he should know what they are doing, what recommendations they are making, and how they feel about certain things.

If you don't do that, you haven't got an organization. You have got just a big melting pot where everybody is throwing things in and who knows what is going on is anybody's guess. I think this is fundamental in organization that this has to be done.

Now, many times it is just passed on without any other work. No other work is done on it and it is passed on and in some cases where these reports are real rough, they have to be typed up. If they are in longhand, they have to be typed up and sent on in.

The main thing is that we get the basic information from the lower level.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: How many other states are carrying on a program similar to ours on this type of deer hunt?

MR. SHANNON: You mean either sex shooting?

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Yes.

MR. SHANNON: Well, I would say the great majority, if not all of the western states. Now, I would say the majority -- well, I would say practically all of the western states and of those states that hunt deer throughout the country, I would say the majority of them hunt either sex deer. I don't have a tabulation.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: In other words, we are not doing anything that is so radical then?

MR. SHANNON: On the contrary, our proposals to hunt either sex is not radical. It is the thing that is commonly done in other states that hunt deer.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Burt, do you have a comment you want to make?

MR. BANZHAF: Yes, I think this is probably one of our reasons for being dissatisfied with the Department. They keep sending out to us reports, as an example, that they will hold an antlerless deer hunt and kill so many deer there a year. I had the pleasure of hunting in Colorado this year for the first time. My wife went with me. I had the opportunity to talk with sportsmen in that area, sportsmen, not members of the Department of Fish and Game, but just sportsmen, people like myself, and I might say from the majority of the people, the majority of the sportsmen that I talked to in the State of Colorado, they are just as dissatisfied with their

Department's policies on antlerless deer hunts as I am, but when I asked the lady at the Department office that I went to why it was they held an antlerless deer hunt in the area where we hunted, it was a special hunt over and beyond the regular season and the deer were very scarce, and she made the statement to me and my wife will back this up under oath that the livestock men control the Department of Fish and Game of the State.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Do you think they do that here?

MR. BANZHAF: No, sir, I can't say that of this State. The point I want to bring out is that the sportsmen are dissatisfied with the policies. Yet, our Department of Fish and Game is trying to present this type of thing to us as being the thing that we should have.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think this brings to a point the necessity of the motion that was made earlier and accepted, for a big game advisory committee to be appointed by the Chairman to study this matter and, Burt, may I ask you at this time would you be willing to serve on that committee?

MR. BANZHAF: Yes, ma'am, I would.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions?

MR. BANZHAF: I have one question I would like to direct to Mr. Shannon. This report that he is speaking about from his unit managers and the pig game thing, I believe is a report that we read last year, and it said in there that public opinion was against an antlerless deer hunt in that

area. Each region was defined and I cannot remember the specific ones, but I do remember that there was one region there that we said in our directors' hearing, well, we won't have to worry about an antlerless deer hunt in this area. The people are against it, and the next thing we knew we had a report that they were going to kill off a thousand deer in that area.

In other words, you went against the unit manager's recommendation that the people were against it and still you asked for a hunt, or how did that work out?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, you heard the question. Now, which county is this, for the record?

MR. BANZHAF: I do not remember. I would have to look it up.

MR. SHANNON: In general I can say this, Mrs. Davis, whereas the unit manager may give the public sentiment, and according to his opinion it is against a deer hunt in that area, we take that recommendation seriously. Now, he might also recommend at the same time that an antlerless hunt should be held to take care of the surplus deer. Before that is acted upon by the Commission, and these are only recommendations by the Department to the Commission, the board of supervisors of that particular county has to concur in it.

Before the Commission will approve a hunt they contact the board of supervisors and the board of supervisors, who probably represent the public thinking in that county, has to concur and if they don't concur, I don't know of a case

where the Commission has had an antlerless hunt and the board of supervisors didn't concur. I want to make clear here to Mr. Banzhaf and Mr. Mitchell and these people that we believe in the scientific management of our deer herds.

At the same time we respect the opinion of the people who don't believe in it, and in a certain area if the people are against this type of thing, we don't propose by any means to try to jam it down their throat. All we can do is tell them what we think, what facts we have and what we recommend, and then we put it up to the Commission in that manner.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by the members of the committee? There is one point very hastily that I want to clarify with you, Mr. Shannon, and that is how many times have you used, I don't know the number of the section in the Fish and Game Code, but it is a statute pertaining to a depredation hunt which actually is not an antlerless hunt, but where you can set up an area for so many hunters where the rancher of that area has a depredation problem.

How many times have you used that statute since it has been on the books?

MR. SHANNON: That is the Teale bill and offhand I couldn't say the exact number of times. I would guess it would be in the neighborhood of maybe four or five or six times.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, wouldn't that statute be one you might consider to try to implement, if there is a serious

problem on depredation in an area where people are opposed to antlerless deer hunts rather than trying to persuade them one way or the other on the antlerless hunt philosophy?

MR. SHANNON: We use that section wherever we can. However, that is rather limiting because that contemplates a small area that has depredation and where you take a certain number of deer to relieve that depredation and in some cases it is difficult to fit large areas into this because whenever we get into a large area then we run into the complication of should this really be under this hunt or under the Bush bill?

So, whereas this section is good, it can't be used universally and there again you run into public opinion. For instance, in some cases we don't like to hold a depredation hunt when people think we are trying to accomplish either sex hunting under the guise of the Teale bill. We don't like to do that either.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much. Our next witness is Jerry David, President of the Southern Council of Conservation Clubs.

(Thereupon Mr. David was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Be seated and proceed.

MR. DAVID: Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Jerry Davis and I am speaking for the Southern Council of Conservation Clubs.

We have found our task of analyzing the Department of Fish and Game expenditures somewhat complicated and confusing. While we accept the report of this committee as being accurate and sincere, our main interest lies in that of the 1960-61 budget. It is our understanding that if this budget is accepted, the Department should show a surplus of more than \$3,500,000 at the end of this period.

We feel a balance of this amount is quite acceptable and to maintain a larger balance may not be as healthy as it could be attractive to outside interests. It is our further understanding that the 1960-61 budget submitted by the Department is reasonably close to their anticipated income.

If this is true, we find this acceptable to our wishes. Beyond this point comes the problems. Where do we find the Department expenditures desirable and where do they become undesirable. To help us find this answer to this question the Southern Council circulated a questionnaire to its member clubs to gain their individual views.

We felt this would be an aid to better analyzing and understanding the composite thinking. The results were quite interesting.

We will start with the three questions requested by your letter, Madam Chairman, of December 7, 1959. The first question, do you wish to continue the program at the present level of financial administration, the composite answer to this question was a qualified yes.

The breakdown by the clubs was 12 yes, 11 no, one club said, "Yes, we do not want an increase in license stamps or tax."

Another club said, "Yes, in some cases, no in others."

They believe the Department of Fish and Game is doing a good job but it would be a mistake if even they were satisfied. Another club said they could not answer due to lack of knowledge.

To question number two, where do you feel there are areas that may require a cutback, The composite answer to this question was, none. The breakdown by the clubs was 5 clubs requesting no cutbacks while one club suggested a cutback on unnecessary waste, another club on departmental heads, 5 suggested -- I hope you will understand these are answers to questionnaires. Five clubs asked for cutbacks in co-ops, one asked for a percentage of cutback on these and one said 50 percent and another asked for 100 percent cutback.

One club said evaluation should be made and cutback on overhead and projects found to be obsolete and not worth their expenditures.

Another club said expenditures for fresh water fish should be cutback.

Thirteen clubs did not answer this. However, I would like to point out that six of these clubs that did not answer were ones that answered yes on the original question which should qualify this question.

On question number three, where do you feel there should be an expansion in certain fields, the composite answer to this was none. However, on the breakdown of the clubs there were four of them, only four clubs that asked for no expansion. The balance of them, three of them said conservation education, public and the Department both, two clubs asked for public relations expansion, another club asked for expansion in salt water and another in salt water patrol, and another in artificial habitat in salt water.

One asked for big game habitat expansion and another one for just habitat development. Research was asked by another club and another for pollution. The trout program was mentioned by another club. Another asked for pheasant co-ops and this club that asked for an expansion in the pheasant co-ops qualified it by saying they should charge for the service.

Another asked for more wardens. Another club asked for an increase in programs in accordance with increase in license sales.

Another club asked for preservation of available recreation areas and access to sale for the future.

Another club asked for expansion in Department control of salt water fishing.

Ten clubs did not answer this question and again I would like to qualify them as nine being answered in the first original question.

In addition to these questions the questionnaire furnished additional information that may be of interest and value to the committee.

We submit these questions and answers for your evaluation. Question number 1, do you feel that programs such as trout and pheasant planting should pay their own way and to what degree? The composite answer to this was yes. The breakdown by the clubs was 19 yes, only 3 voted against it, 1 asked for a 75 percent paying of their own way, another one merely said partially, and two clubs did not answer and one would not change the trout program. They would leave it the way it was financially.

On question number 2, do you favor the Department's present trout planting program, the composite answer is yes. The breakdown on this again is 19 clubs said they would favor the program, 1 said no, 5 would stock pressure areas heavier while 1 would stock habitat areas heavier and 1 answer contradicted itself.

And question number 3, did you favor the Department's present pheasant planting program? The composite answer to this was yes. The breakdown was 12 yes, 3 no, 3 would charge more for co-ops, 3 would increase co-ops and 1 would decrease co-ops. Two would plant habitat area and 1 would plant non-habitat area. One suggested they plant hens in the A zone and cocks in the B zone. One did not answer this.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I might say, Jerry, we are getting

a little confused if the membership really can get together.

MR. DAVID: I think, Mrs. Davis, this always exists, but I think it is interesting. If I merely came up and said yes, we wanted this or no, we did not want it -- this is the individual thinking. It is something new and when I compiled or tried to compile it to get results from this, I decided to give you the entire thing.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: It certainly points out and propounds the problems a Legislature has in making its decisions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Jerry, did I hear you say one club said they agreed in principle that we shouldn't concur with the Department?

MR. DAVID: What was this, Mr. Pattee?

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: I thought I heard somewhere in the start of the dissertation that one club said, "We agree with the Department, but in principle we just can't concur with them."

MR. DAVID: No, I believe the question you are referring to --

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: It seemed to me I heard that somewhere along the line that "We think they are doing a good job, but we won't admit it."

MR. DAVID: From memory I think the question was like this, that we think the Department was doing a good job, however, they thought that even if the Department thought they were doing a good job and didn't need improvements they

would be making a mistake themselves.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: In other words, don't agree with them.

MR. DAVID: No, they thought the Department should agree they weren't doing all they could. Once you agree you are doing a good job, you have stopped progress. Once you are satisfied where you are at you stop progressing. I think this is what the club was thinking about.

In other words, we should never be satisfied where we are at, we should always try to do better. I think that is the one that was confusing. Where did I leave off?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: While you are finding your place, I want to introduce one of our fellow colleagues, Assemblyman House. If you care to join us we will be happy to have you join us, although we won't be here very much longer. Here is the problem I have been pointing up to the sportsmen. Until they become unified they are going to have real serious problems as far as trying to have the legislators analyze the things that the sportsmen really want or don't want.

All right, will you proceed, Jerry?

MR. DAVID: Mrs. Davis, this concludes the questionnaire as far as I decided to report to the committee. There were other questions on there. Some of them might be interesting to the committee. However, for sake of time I would not talk about those. I would like to touch on generally some subjects that were brought up and some of the committee seemed

interest in. One of them was conservation education.

We feel generally that we should advance in this field too. We feel that the Department is spending a lot of money on this, but it is an important project. No doubt we can improve the dissemination of material. I think they are trying to get it out to the right people, but there are many ways which a sportsman can help in this same program.

One of them is the project that the Southern Council took on fourteen years ago, will be fifteen years this April. We participate in the local sportsman show where we get a chance to meet the public and we have a booth there where we disseminate literature of all types, not only the Department of Fish and Game, but other types of literature for the Forest Service and so forth and all related to conservation work.

With this we man the booth and attempt to answer to the public and correlate the literature with them so we are sure they are going to get the good out of it that was intended. I think this is one project that can be carried on in other parts of the State and it is a method of getting the information out to the people that are interested.

Also, the question they ask when they come to the booth decides a lot on what type of literature we hand them.

On the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report, we took a period before the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources and quoted the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report.

We used it as a guide. Many of the committee chairmen have the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report in their possession. We were short a few copies. They are passing back and forth. One in particular was the vice chairman of the Council of the Southern California group. He carries it with him and he uses it as a dictionary.

Many of our facts and figures come out of this book. However, I believe the report itself is coming to a place where it is two years old and soon will wear out as far as facts in it are concerned, and probably, I don't suggest replacing it with another survey, but I hope by then, in another year or two, we will resolve many, many of these problems.

I think the Department is working on this very strongly. Two months ago we had a member of the Department out to the Council at one of our meetings in which he went down item by item in the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report on the recommendations and told the Council just where they stood on these items. They were very interested. It took about two hours for the program.

However, the Council members were very interested and attentive all the way through, so I believe it is valuable and I think it paid off in a lot of ways.

At this time the Southern Council has enjoyed the privilege of appearing before this committee and we hope the information that we have given you may be of some help. It

would be our pleasure to attempt to answer your questions and clarify the report to the best of our ability.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: Mr. David, the first part of your statement there, did I hear right when you said that when the Department submitted their 1960-61 budget that there should be a surplus in excess of \$3,000,000? Is that what you said?

MR. DAVID: It is our understanding that if this 1960-61 budget is accepted as it was submitted by the Department, there would still be remaining a surplus in the funds of three and a half million dollars. That is substantial in our opinion, but I settled for this figure because it was below where it was supposed to be.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: I see, I misunderstood you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, do you have any comments to make on Mr. David's presentation?

MR. SHANNON: No, except the votes of the clubs were certainly interesting.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: It is probably like the survey the Department makes once in awhile. Do you have better success than this other council did in their survey from the membership as far as making a survey of what the sportsmen want in the State?

MR. SHANNON: I wouldn't say every time, but I might add this, too. This points up the problem that not

only the Legislature has in conducting fish and game business, but also the problem the Department has in trying to satisfy the people we serve.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, evidently we are going to adjourn today on the tone that we all have problems. Thank you very much, Jerry.

MR. DAVID: I would like to thank you, Madam Chairman, and also all the members of the committee for their attention to this and the rest of the papers that have been given before you because I know it is very tiresome and it is very valuable to us, and I hope something real valuable comes out of it, and I am sure it will.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Gilchrist, I understand you wanted to testify before this committee and is there anyone else in the audience other than Mr. Bruce who is going to make a summary?

(Thereupon Mr. Gilchrist was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Be seated and proceed.

MR. GILCHRIST: Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John Gilchrist and as of today I am representing the San Francisco Tyee Club before this committee. I would like to make a brief statement in regard to this presentation of the Tyee Club.

The first time I saw this thing was at 9:00 o'clock yesterday morning when through the kindness of your office

I was handed this communication which informed me that following a special meeting of the board of directors I had been elected as their legislative chairman, and I have not had the privilege of even discussing this program with the members of this club.

However, I can say before presenting the program to you that in essence and almost without exception the entire program is word for word with the thinking of the various organizations.

I further might point out to this committee that I think this whole thing, including my appointment, which I do take some pride in because I think it is the first time in history such a thing has ever happened, I might like to point out to the committee that this program that has been developed by the Tyee Club is actually the result of about three years' effort between the sports groups, the commercial groups, unions and all other interested parties.

In other words, this is the result of a lot of study of a lot of people, and I would like to herewith present this for your consideration with the understanding, Madam Chairman and members of the committee, that this is the first time I have presented it.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: What is the Tyee Club, Madam Chairman?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You will have to ask Mr. Gilchrist that question.

MR. GILCHRIST: Assemblyman Pattee, the Tyee Club is an organization of sports fishermen dedicated to the enhancement of the preservation and propagation of the king salmon. It is one of the largest organizations of its kind and it has its counterpart in other sections of the country particularly in Oregon, Washington and Canada. This is their adopted program.

Number 1. That applied basic research be expanded and coordinated with the several states and the universities and that applied research be further developed by the Department of Fish and Game.

If I may comment very briefly on that one point, that, of course, has been discussed at length by all four organizations, or five organizations I might say. And we are in full accord on that. We have discussed this at great lengths with the Department of Fish and Game. There is very little variance between any of us.

2. That the downstream planting and marking program be further enlarged and developed. Those of you who will remember, that was a program that you gave us authority to start last year.

3. A sportsmen's tagging program to further assist the Department in catch and migration studies be developed.

4. That specific legislation be enacted to provide adequate water of proper quality be maintained by any agency damming, diverting or using same for the proper sustenance

and preservation and the continuity of fish and wildlife. They are specifically referring to the problems we are now facing on both the San Joaquin and Mokelumne Rivers. We are all in accord on that.

6. Expansion of conservation education program. In other words, we are all fully in accord with expansion of that particular program.

7. Development of a program to voluntarily clean up our water, beaches and forests from the activities of litterbugs.

8. That Coleman Hatchery be enlarged and further utilized to the fullest capacity. We are all in accord on these last two counts.

9. That adequate legislation be provided for screening water diversions as recommended by the Department of Fish and Game.

In conclusion, they note that it is resolved that the Department of Fish and Game be commended for the excellent cooperation given by the regional officers in the development of the close working relationship, further that those men of the Department and those others who contributed so much of their own to the salvaging of the salmon run at Nimbus be publically commended and thanked;

Further that adequate funds be provided from the several sources to effect the completion of these programs.

On that last, Madam Chairman and members of the

committee, I might point out that all three agencies have been working in very close cooperation with the Department of Fish and Game for the last two or three years and that we have enjoyed their confidence and their guidance and their cooperation on these problems that I am referring to at the present time.

They have been in attendance at all of our meetings. Now, the only thing that I would call your attention to would be this particular point, number 5, and I am quite sure that all three organizations will come forward with a program which will call for an extended natural spawning program or spawning of salmon under natural conditions. We are working on that at the present time.

We have encountered some problems that have not yet been answered. As soon as the Department does come up with this, I am very sure it will be the intention of these groups to try to present legislation to effect that program.

At the present time that is all I have to offer to the committee. I am grateful that I have had the opportunity of presenting this program on behalf of the San Francisco Tyee Club.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions by the members of the committee? Mr. Shannon?

MR. SHANNON: No.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Gilchrist.

MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I might ask the permission of the committee at this time to insert into the record the figures that were given by Mr. Dave Keller from the Legislative Analyst's office on the concept and the basic uses and expenditures and the balances of the frozen fund monies. Is there any objection? It consists of the same basic things he gave to us verbally, but he wanted to be sure it was clear.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: I so move.

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: Second the motion.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: All those in favor say aye.

(The motion was voted on.)

The motion is carried so now it is in the record.

(The letter referred to above appears at page 376, line 10,, hereof.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Is there anyone else in the audience that wanted to speak? Oh, Mr. Phipps.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: Are we going to have another hearing of the Fish and Game Committee some time in the future?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: We are thinking very seriously of having another meeting if we can fit it into the schedules of the different Assemblymen in February on range improvement control, brush burning and things of that sort. Do you have anything in mind that you wanted to discuss?

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: No, it is getting late and if you want another meeting later on I wanted to ask the

Department a question and I will get it at that time. I don't want to clutter up the record on this.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: It is up to you, Mr. Lunardi.

(Thereupon Mr. Phipps was duly and regularly sworn by Mrs. Davis.)

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Will you please state who you are speaking for, Mr. Phipps?

MR. PHIPPS: Thank you, Madam Chairman, for the privilege. My name is Cecil Phipps. I am speaking in this particular instance as an individual sportsman. I do appreciate the privilege of doing so. I had come to Sacramento following my interest in matters of fish and game merely to observe. However, during the course of the two day session I noted a great many facets of fish and game management were, I thought, being overlooked.

Subsequently some of my colleagues in the California Wildlife Federation covered some of that ground, so it has been taken care of to some extent. However, there are two or three things that I would like very much to have inserted in the record.

I feel perhaps it might be in order to qualify me as an individual sportsman taking up your valuable time today and I should like to tell you that I am a former president of the Sportmen's Council of Central California, presently Vice President again. I am a director of the California Wildlife Federation, a past president for two years of the

Fresno County Sportsmen's Club, the Chairman of the Fresno County Recreation Commission and a member of various advisory boards to such organizations as the Forest Service and so forth.

I am not attempting to qualify me as an expert, merely to show you my broad interest in all fields of outdoor recreation and especially fish and game.

There is one point I would like to be able to take back to Fresno with me and that is a clarification of the fiscal position of the Department of Fish and Game. Down in our area a great many people become disturbed with the prospect of a license increase. Knowing full well the history of the increase a couple of years ago, primarily due to the fact I was in Sacramento almost weekly at that time in my capacity as President of the Council, I was disturbed by the information being disseminated pursuing to that theme. I am happy to learn since arriving at this hearing that apparently while there were two schools of thought on the fiscal position of the Department, it was merely due to the fact that they were taken from apparently two sets of figures.

I believe the points of difference primarily are the frozen funds as they have been referred to during the last two days. In that connection I would like to present the position of our council at the time I was president of it, 1957-58.

We discussed this very thoroughly on numerous occasions and it was our, not completely unanimous but almost

so, opinion that there should be a general across the board \$2 license increase. However, during the course of the deliberations of the various committees of the Legislature, the stamp plan was agreed upon.

To this we had no objection. The 50 percent frozen portion of it was again by action of the Legislature and again we did not object to that.

However, it is our understanding in the central part of the State, and when I say "our" understanding, again I think I am safe in speaking for this particular council because over the years they have certainly backed me up in statements such as this. It is their general impression that they are paying \$5 to go trout fishing and that the \$5 goes to the Department of Fish and Game for management and development, perpetuation and conservation of our resources without any strings attached.

I wanted this committee to know that that was the basis upon which they supported this increase in 1957. Now, it is my understanding and I intend to take this home with me, and I wish you would correct me if I am wrong, that since the license increase the Department has accumulated a surplus greater than what it was at the time and that it is expected to be a substantial surplus by 1961-62. By that I mean it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of in excess of \$4,000,000 and in view of that, if the money is used for the purposes that the remaining funds are used, then obviously

there would be no necessity for a license increase.

Now, is that basically correct, Madam Chairman?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think what we should do, if you will, Mr. Shannon, will you pick up that letter from the Analyst's office that is before you there and read it word by word so that there is no misunderstanding.

MR. SHANNON: Well, this is a letter to Mrs. Davis from Gilbert G. Lentz, Assistant Legislative Analyst from the Legislative Analyst's office.

"Dear Assemblywoman Davis:

"In reply to your request concerning the so-called 'frozen funds' in the Fish and Game Preservation Fund resulting from the provisions of Chapter 1887 of the Statutes of 1957, the following are the amounts both actual and estimated which have accrued or will accrue.

<u>"Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amounts</u>
1957-58	\$ 667,519
1958-59	1,548,515
1959-60 (est.)	1,615,960
1960-61 (est.)	<u>1,681,105</u>
Total	\$5,513,099
Less to Booz, Allen & Hamilton	<u>97,500</u>
Net	\$5,415,599

"We have estimated the surplus at the end of the budget year 1960-61 to be \$4,889,059 which does not take into

account the capital outlay for the current fiscal year and what might be proposed for the budget year. Whatever these are, they would reduce the surplus further.

"Furthermore, based on the agency's proposals as expressed in the preliminary budget hearings, our calculations make an arbitrary assumption that the expenditures, for support during the budget year will be on the order of \$10,800,000. Again this does not include capital outlay.

"From the foregoing you may note that the estimated surplus will be short of the calculated 'frozen funds' by about \$526,000.

"We should also point out that when Chapter 1887 went into effect there was an estimated surplus in the Fish and Game Preservation Fund of over \$2,500,000. "

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Does that answer your questions, Mr. Phipps?

MR. PHIPPS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In other words, I think that is very clearly put to you that at the present time certainly they are going to with the use of the frozen monies, they are all right, but in the future there may be a problem and this is what the committee was trying to point out to you people as a possibility in our cover letter of our report.

At no time was I indicating that there would definitely be a license increase, nor that I was in favor of one, because I have been a champion against the increase of

license fees.

MR. PHIPPS: I might remind you, Madam Chairman, that again some of the legislators were disturbed because of the lack of dissemination of information to the general public, and it seems as though sportsmen's club members comprise probably less than ten percent of the license buyers. In my own particular locality this particular press release occasioned numerous letters to the "Public Thinks column" on the local newspaper protesting a license increase.

In that connection I believe you stated yesterday that you had the impression that the sportsmen after some testimony here would not be opposed to a license increase. I think maybe I can assure you that the contrary would be the truth in the central part of the State. I think we would oppose a license increase in view of the figures just read here. We don't think it is necessary. We still think the frozen funds belong for the purpose for which they were raised.

One other item that I want to touch on and it has been touched on several times, and that is the Department budget and the proposed increases in it. I think probably I am like the average sportsman. I can read the Department budget. It means about as much to me as my insurance policies do. I don't understand them either, but I do read them. I am concerned about the apparent tendency to belittle the twenty-five requested personnel for water research projects. I am concerned because in my capacity as Chairman of the Fresno County Recreation

Commission, for example, I have been witness to seven big brand new water impoundments being built in Fresno County, one of them still under construction, and the resulting problems that they have brought on our local area without any compensating funds anywhere along the line for recreational features.

I am concerned because I think perhaps at the completion of the proposed California Water Plan, our concept of fishing in the outdoors may be entirely different than what we know it today. I am thinking in terms of perhaps thirty years from now. To me the most important function that the Department can do is to safeguard the interests of our wildlife for the future years.

There again, I can cite the example of the construction of Friant Dam. If we had had a Department and a Director with sufficient foresight at that time, I am confident we would not have fifty miles of dry stream bed on the San Joaquin River. I believe we would also have a considerably better salmon run than we have today.

Again, I would like to cite another example of some months ago the former director of the Department was held up in what you might term ridicule in a local newspaper over his actions or concern over the disposal of radio active waste. Those of us interested in the future welfare have checked into this further and believe me we are disturbed over it, too. To me I think the Department is to be complimented in keeping

abreast of these needs and the California Water Plan to me, I think, is the greatest danger and still at the same time perhaps one of the greatest assets that fish and wildlife can face in this State.

I am certain that the majority of the sportsmen in the Central California area, and of this I am almost positive, would definitely favor funds made available for complete investigation of all proposed water projects and there again in my particular county, I am well aware of the work and the man hours that have been put in on these seven projects that the two utility companies have built and are building in our area, the fights that we have had to go through to maintain adequate stream flows and that sort of thing, and without the capable help of the Department personnel obviously the sportsmen could not possibly have been successful.

So I strongly urge that that be given serious consideration. Again, in my own personal opinion, I deplore the need of license dollars to accomplish this. To me this is a project or an expense that should be borne by the project itself rather than using our license, our conservation perpetuation license funds for that purpose.

I can't urge you too strongly to give that serious consideration. Just one more brief thought and I will cease, Madam Chairman. I have obtained one thing out of this two day hearing which certainly made it worthwhile for me, and that is the fact that it has been amply demonstrated on

numerous occasions during the past two days the needs and place for trained technicians in fish and wildlife management. I think it has been amply demonstrated here time and time again that we sportsmen don't know all the answers.

We continually have to refer to the Department even though we don't always buy their programs. I have heard over the past fifteen years the Department biologists held up to continued ridicule and yet I know that a great many of those are university trained, sincere, dedicated men, quite competent in their chosen field, and wildlife management is becoming an accepted course of study in some of the major universities nationwide.

Just one other thought. I view with alarm the tendency to earmark funds. I think this committee of legislators is very much aware of the dangers involved in specifically earmarking funds for any specific person. In that connection I would urge that the Fish and Game Commission be delegated or directed perhaps might be the word, to balance their expenditures and their programs within the reasonable bounds of income as has been demonstrated here today. I think it is the general consensus that by and large most projects and proposals should carry their own weight from the income field.

There again, in that connection, considerable discourse was had on the way this money is to be allocated and the way it was to be spent and so forth, but very little was said about where it comes from, the actual breakdown of where

it comes from and there again I am pointing up the mass of license buyers in Southern California. I have skipped over a number of things in the interest of time, but I am sure the committee here will keep on top of them as they come up in these management proposals and projects.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, Mr. Phipps, I assume from your comments relative to the water projects phase of your presentation that you recognize with many other people, including myself, the real necessity for the fish and game people to become aware and alert and do the work in the water program as it decends upon us, good or bad, which probably in most parts of it would be good as far as all phases are concerned, but you also recognize that in view of the fact that industry, domestic supply, for the use of irrigation and all the other investigations that are being made, those monies are coming from the water fund which are Tideland Oil monies and general fund monies, so you feel then that also recreation and this facet of the fish and game program, those monies should be forthcoming from that same source? Am I correct in my assumption that you believe it should receive the same recognition?

MR. PHIPPS: You are correct and I believe the California Wildlife Federation, if I am not mistaken, concurs in that.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Then, you are somewhat suggesting

to Mr. Shannon, if I am correct, that he seek this avenue of financing?

MR. PHIPPS: I am merely suggesting this, that this committee I think should perhaps seek that avenue of financing, but in no instance should the Department of Fish and Game not get the work done because there are not public funds available for that purpose, and again a word of caution in this regard, that recreation as we are beginning to know it, outdoor recreation, particularly as it pertains to water is becoming a big business and fish and game is only one little part of it.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I realize that, Mr. Phipps, but I think realistically we are going to have to be very factual and recognize that if you give a director of any department, be it Mr. Shannon in this particular case, if he would be waiting upon the Governor and consulting with him on the possible approach of financing this from the general fund or water fund for this purpose, that is half of the battle.

I mean this committee can only do so much. If the director is making an energetic approach for this, customarily it receives a great deal of attention. If he isn't, for some reason or other, then of course you have a terrific battle on your hands. So I think that this should be pointed out to you.

MR. PHIPPS: Well, I am not a political strategist and I know nothing of the why and where by which they are accomplished.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Good luck, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much. Now, I understand there is no one else in the audience that wishes to make a comment for the record. Eddie Bruce, the President of the California Wildlife Federation wants to sum this meeting up.

MR. BRUCE: Does my oath still stand?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Yes, indeed it does.

MR. BRUCE: Madam Chairman and members, thank you for this second opportunity to appear. This enables the Federation to sum up to some extent the testimony of its member councils. For the record, the Federation is deeply indebted to you, Madam Chairman, for your support of legislation that has greatly benefited the sportsmen, specifically with regard to Assembly Bills 140 and 141 which we regard as two of the best bills.

I might add that in this regard and others, the Federation has gone all out to support the author and the contents of these. Water is of vital interest to us and we are happy to receive the support of our legislator in these regards.

Regarding the Booz, Allen and Hamilton recommendations, we did not take this report and make from it specific recommendations in connection with the Department's proposed budget. However, I am sure that you and your combined wisdom as legislators can note that in all but a few places the member councils of the Federation have recommended change

specifically in regard to the trout and pheasant programs.

This was done by the Federation with the combined support of the member councils and was stated to this body in its general sense as our policy. You have noted that the Federation's policy on trout and pheasants does differ greatly from the Department's recommendation to the Commission. We do agree on the basic issue that these programs should pay their way.

The inference would be then that the Federation would be opposed to a license increase and would therefore push for all our worth to hold the line of attempting to keep costs down, but would still be realistic in our thinking when confronted with the real problems as noted each and every day by the ever increasing population.

As I promised to you, Madam Chairman, while under oath that we would at our next meeting discuss the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report and the more specific recommendations, and would send a report of our actions to you immediately following, and I am very sorry indeed that the member councils of this Federation did not take these issues on in their entirety and for that reason I, as their spokesman, can only report to you under oath their exact statement.

In this regard, while I should desire to submit a more concise recommendation from the Federation, you can therefore see that I am only testifying as to what action specifically the Federation has taken. It is vitally important

to the Federation to establish good public relations with the Legislature and agencies of government that we come in contact with.

Our thinking and actions taken are based on the facts as we know them to be and are not based on intimidation by anybody, be it the Legislature or an agency.

We feel that this committee has performed basic functions of its office and has been received with great interest by the people you represent. In other words, we as a united federation of councils are appreciative of your effort in our behalf. Your reward has been our constant support of you in your individual district, and as long as you continue as you have, you will continue to receive our most profound appreciation.

I should like to submit for the record and read in the same, our policy on rough fish and our policy on the proposed water resources development bond act, which will be acted on by voters of this State. May I have your permission?

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: You may.

MR. BRUCE: This is the resolution by the California Wildlife Federation dealing with the subject of rough fish control:

"RESOLVED by the California Wildlife Federation that we hereby concur with Associated Sportmen's resolution number 57-11 dated November, 1956, which was reaffirmed at

the ASC convention at Santa Cruz in September, that rough fish control in our large low and middle elevation trout streams, which are dominated by a large population of rough fish, is necessary for the competent management of our wild trout fishery.

"The request contained in this resolution is based upon the Taft-Murphy study printed in California Fish and Game Quarterly for April, 1950, entitled 'Life History of the Sacramento Squawfish'."

This is the resolution of the California Wildlife Federation relative to the California Water Resources Development Bond Act:

"WHEREAS, the members of this federation are deeply concerned over the absence of language in the California Water Resources Development Bond Act (Chapter 1762 of the Statutes of 1959) providing for the protection and enhancement of the fish and wildlife resources, and other recreational developments, of this state, on a non-reimbursable basis, in connection with the proposed water development program; and

"WHEREAS, it is the position of this federation that provisions for the protection and enhancement of fish, wildlife and recreation are of the utmost importance to the health and well being of the people of the entire state and that provision therefore should clearly be made in the Bond Act prior to it's submission to the voters of the state for their approval;

"Now, therefore, be it

"RESOLVED by the CALIFORNIA WILDLIFE FEDERATION that the Governor of the State of California be respectfully urged to convene the Legislature in a Special Session for the purpose of clarifying the policy contained in the California Water Resources Development Bond Act with respect to, among other things, a financing provision for protection and enhancement of fish, wildlife and other phases of recreation; and be it further

"RESOLVED that the secretary of this federation be directed to transmit a copy of this RESOLUTION to the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California."

Specifically in this regard, a copy of this resolution was placed on the Governor's desk yesterday morning.

I am, however, not prepared to advance any great dissertation on this bond act specifically in regard to money or project. We, as you have noted, are most concerned with the recreational values. As legislators you are more prepared to discuss the other ramifications to which I have referred, and Assembly Bill 140 and 141, in those bills we had our interests spelled into the language.

In the bond issue we are at the mercy of an agency. It is possible to work this matter out with the agency in question. However, it would require a terrific amount of leg work, so as a result we have asked our Governor to concur with our simple request as outlined in our resolution. We

earnestly solicit the support of this committee in this regard.

In finalizing this, may I personally extend the Federation's gratitude to you for the fine exhibition of public relations in your office as Chairman of this committee. I personally feel you have extended yourself even beyond your scope of office. For this we are appreciative indeed. The Federation will continue to work with and assist your committee by giving you the basis of our thinking. We shall try at every turn to separate facts from figures and so doing we hope to impress upon the legislators and agencies of government our principal position in all matters of concern to all the people that I represent.

And this must be administered by competent legislation. Without this feature we would certainly differ in our thinking. We must also always bear in mind that man in his zeal to accomplish his purpose frequently destroys as he builds.

Now, if there any questions, I would be very happy to answer them if I may.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any questions? Mr. Pattee.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Do I understand you correctly, sir, that you have asked the Governor to call a Special Session to see that the recreation and the wildlife is brought into the water bill?

MR. BRUCE: This is correct, Mr. Pattee.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: What if he refuses? Are you

going to take the attitude that maybe the sportsmen will not back the bond issue?

MR. BRUCE: The sportsmen have committed themselves by this resolution, Mr. Pattee, and I imagine that would be our position.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: That would be your position?

MR. BRUCE: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Any other questions? Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: In that case, Mr. Bruce, I have to ask you a question as to why it is your organization feels that what is primarily a financing measure should include all such details as you have mentioned when they are covered by existing law and can be covered by newly enacted statutes?

MR. BRUCE: It is our feeling, Mr. Williamson, that this resolution was directed to the Governor just merely to provide for this case, that is all.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: You have stated it should be included in the bond bill?

MR. BRUCE: That is true.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: And your organization has undertaken this as a thoughtful step thinking it is a constructive thing for the State of California?

MR. BRUCE: This is our thinking, that it is entirely constructive, Mr. Williamson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAMSON: I am disappointed.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: I am very glad.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Well, I might make a comment since all the other members are. I think this is a very constructive approach because there is no wording in 1106 that gives any financial guarantee for recreation or fish and game, and I think financially this must be spelled out, and this is one of the things that we have been discussing for quite some time, and I think the sportsmen in the state realistically recognize that unless they are taken care of, at least considered at the very outset of any project that is going to impound water, they are going to be left out in the cold.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: That is right.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Are there any other questions or comments by members of the committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN DE LOTTO: I move we adjourn.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUNARDI: Second.

MR. BRUCE: I have several other comments to make. I will hurry up.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I am sorry.

MR. BRUCE: I should like to point out to the committee regarding the subject of conservation education, we are in direct relation to the National Wildlife Federation holding a national wildlife week which is concurred in by Governor's proclamation each and every year. This year it will be March 20 to 26. The Federation definitely is an

integral working part of this. We also have several other associations which we deal with specifically in this regard. I would like to comment on Mr. Thomas' question to one of the gentlemen who appeared as a witness when the statement was made about who was the parent body or the parent organization in the State.

I can assure you, Madam Chairman and members, the California Wildlife Federation is the recognized parent organization in this State. It is recognized by the National Wildlife Federation, by the National Rifle Association, by the Ducks Unlimited, Salmon Unlimited, and many, many others and is inferred by the legislative material which appears on the legislators' desks such as your legislative bulletin as the spokesman for the State of California.

For example, on your agenda you have Sportsmen's Council of the Redwood Empire, Inland Council of Conservation Clubs, San Diego County Wildlife Federation, Sportsmen's Council of Central California, Fresno County Sportsmen's Club, Ocean Fish Protective Association, Golden State Sports Fishers, Southern Council of Conservation Clubs -- all these which have appeared to present their testimony before this committee are integral working parts of the California Wildlife Federation.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I think there is one clarification, with all due respect to your federation, Mr. Bruce, that should be made and that is that there are many organizations throughout my area that I represent and some other areas in

Northern California and some in Central California that are most active but not affiliated with your association, so when you speak of representing the entire state, you represent the state as far as the organizations that are affiliated with you, am I correct?

MR. BRUCE: That is correct, Mrs. Davis, and I might add this that in the subject of diversification I might even remark that in all probability there is diversified thinking among your own committee and therefore I think the sportsmen can possibly move in the same direction.

We are hopeful of pulling our forces together and with your kind assistance we shall do so.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I, like you, cannot control the members of my committee.

MR. BRUCE: I should like to compliment Mr. Williamson on his motion in which you have established a citizens' advisory committee on the subject of deer. This is one of the internal problems that exist within the framework of sportsmen's organizations throughout the State of California. That is our bugaboo.

I am very sure that is reminiscent of Assembly Bill 3005, your bill, Madam Chairman, which did not pass. The Wildlife Federation would be very happy to assist you in this regard. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Mr. Shannon, would you like to make any comments before we adjourn?

MR. SHANNON: I have no particular comments except to thank the committee and particularly the chairman for conducting a very fair and impartial hearing, and we are happy to be here and be able to offer helpful information if that was the case. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you very much. May I take thos opportunity of thanking all the witnesses that have come to Sacramento to testify before this committee and also the members of the Department and the press which have sat here very patiently waiting for a good hot story, and particularly the members of my committee. Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

(Thereupon the hearing was adjourned.)

(The following letters are made an official part of the transcript of this hearing at the instruction of the Chairman.)

"Ward's Propane Service

"P.O. Box 217

"Crescent City, California

"January 12, 1960

"Pauline L. Davis, Chairman

Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game

"Assembly P.O. Box 2

"State Capitol Annex

"Sacramento 14, California

"Dear Mrs. Davis:

"The Fish and Game Committee of the Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce have discussed your letter and your coming meeting. Due to the distance and time involved, it will not be possible for us to attend the meeting, but we would like to make the following recommendations:

"That fishing license fees be increased and the increase used for the operation of fish hatcheries in California. The actual cost of the license is a very small percentage of the total amount spent by fishermen, and any objection to an increase would not have a valid foundation.

"The pheasant population in California is at a dangerous low and it appears that either the season should be kept closed, or that the pheasant license tags be at least tripled and the revenue raised be used for the planting of pheasants.

"Very truly yours,

"Maris Ward, Chairman

"Fish & Game Committee

"Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce"

---oOo---

"Northern Counties

"Wildlife Conservation Association

"Assemblywoman Pauline L. Davis, Chairman

"Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game

"Room 4115-4117

"State Capitol

"Sacramento 14, California

"Dear Mrs. Davis:

"We herewith submit certain undeniable facts upon which are based some of the purposes of our organization, together with recommendations pertinent thereto. We respectfully request you give these matters your carefully considered attention in appraising the value and scope of the 'services' rendered by the California Department of Fish and Game.

"1. The wildlife is a public resource which belongs to all the people of the state.

"2. The sportsmen who hunt and fish represent less than 10% of the population.

"3. Any state agency must act in the better interest of the majority of the people. Otherwise such an agency cannot be justified as a function of state government.

"4. The purpose of the Department of Fish and Game is to 'Preserve, Protect and Restore' the wildlife (Wildlife Conservation Act).

"5. It is not the purpose of the Department of Fish and Game to provide meat or fish for anyone.

"6. If providing is to be done, it must be done by

private enterprise and initiative with private capital.

"7. By providing, arranging for and engaging in promotion of hunting and fishing, the Department of Fish and Game is not acting in the interest of the majority of the people of this state because the overwhelming majority of the people derive no benefit from such activities.

"8. The only justifiable reason for this state agency to engage in arranging for killing of any part of the public resource of fish and game is for the purpose of controlling depredation of private or public land. This must be done on a limited basis by the best qualified hunters under the strict supervision of the wildlife protection branch of the Department of Fish and Game.

"9. Game or Unit Management is not necessary unless the killing of the female deer is allowed. This was admitted by Mr. A. Starker Leopold of the University of California at an open meeting on the U.C. Campus in 1959.

"10. By returning the Department of Fish and Game to its proper division status as primarily a wildlife protection agency, such as it was under the Department of Natural Resources, the following accomplishments could be achieved:

"a. This agency would again function in the better interest of the people and not contrary to the intent of the very act under which it was created.

"b. Approximately \$5,000,000 per year could be saved by eliminating the game managers which would no longer be

necessary.

"c. It is at this time evident that the majority of the people of this state are not willing to accept the present policies of this governmental agency. These policies, which reek of commercialism and encourage the use of a great public resource as a 'harvestable' commodity and a mere plaything for a small minority of shooters and other commercial interests, can no longer be tolerated by morally honest citizens.

"We sincerely believe the adoption of legislation based upon the above facts is the most logical solution to the present dilemma of the Fish and Game Department acceptable to the owners of our fish and game resources; the citizens of California.

"We urgently request that the foregoing testimony be given such consideration by your committee as this honest effort to present true facts rightfully deserves.

"Respectfully submitted,

"NORTHERN COUNTIES WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

"Charles Bull, President "

(The above letter was notarized by Frances A. Hopper, Notary Public in and for the County of Shasta, State of California, on January 30, 1960, and bears the seal of the aforementioned notary public.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

---oOo---

This is to certify that I, Alice Book, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, was present at the time and place the foregoing proceedings were had and taken before the Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game, held in Sacramento, California, on January 18 and 19, 1960, and that as such reporter I did take down such proceedings in shorthand writing and that thereafter I caused the shorthand writing to be transcribed into longhand typewriting, and the foregoing pages, beginning at the top of page 1, to and including page 398, constitute a true, complete, accurate and correct transcript of the aforementioned shorthand writing.

Dated this 11th day of February, 1960.

Certified Shorthand Reporter

My organization represents in excess of 2500 members. I also have additional representation among property owners in my area. In presenting my testimony, I wish the Committee on Fish and Game to understand I do not represent the hunters or the fishermen, although I am not against hunting and fishing.

I. BOOZ, ALLEN AND HAMILTON REPORT. This report is a complete waste of the taxpayers money because it in no way attempts to settle the responsibility of the Fish and Game Department, but rather it points up only the manner in which the Fish and Game Department spends its money and offers only very mild corrective measures. Evidently no one is interested in the basic question - is the State of California, through its Fish and Game Department, required to furnish hunting and fishing to hunters and fishermen? Would you suggest it would also be the State's duty to furnish gasoline to car owners because we have petroleum resources? Or perhaps lumber for the people's homes because the state has large timber resources?

II. I would be amazed if your committee would condone the Fish and Game Department appearing before it in such an unprepared state. Their performance in front of this Committee revealed such lack of basic knowledge of the operating schedules of their Department as to make me wonder if they really know what to do or how to do it. They had several weeks to study the Booz-Allen-Hamilton report and reconcile it to their operation, yet this is the organization that wants to spend millions of dollars to give the hunters and fishermen more hunting and fishing. At no time did I hear anyone tell the committee that the protection of the wild life would or should be a part of the duties of the Fish and Game Department. I firmly believe that if these facts were known to the general public, a real fight would develop.

(The following points are listed in my letter of December 18, 1959)

The basic law on Fish and Game, as I understand it, is the protection of wildlife and natural game resources to the exclusion of all else. The above precept is the basic philosophy and I will not deviate from it.

The above policy means closing depleted areas to allow nature to replenish these areas.

It means the strict enforcement of game laws.

It means we do not need fish hatcheries or bird stocking programs. We do not need biologists and game "managers". Wildlife needed for restocking depleted areas can be purchased for much less than hatcheries or bird farms can produce them.

It means we do not need tremendous amounts of money. In other words, instead of approximately \$11,000,000.00 per year, we could do a wonderful job of game law enforcement for \$2,000,000.00 and eventually even hunters and fishermen would be satisfied. Above all, resources would be properly protected.

It means putting Fish and Game in its proper light of a natural resource, to be protected and enjoyed for the benefit of all as mother nature has provided.

It means rotation of these resources to give mother nature, the greatest replenisher we have, a chance to work. We must go back to the precept of closing areas where fish and game are being decimated to give them a chance to revive naturally.

It means the State of California must get out of the business of providing fish or game for anyone who will buy a license. I am sure this Committee recognizes that in a democracy, a governmental agency is basically operating illegally if they engage in a business, so your Committee must see that the Fish and Game Department gets out of business.

It means a reduction in taxes, because no matter how one phrases it or dresses it up, the Department is causing the total tax burden on the people of California to be increased. Your Committee is charged with the responsibility of seeing that the Department is managed at the least possible cost.

I now close my testimony with the following resume. If you are truly concerned in representing the majority of the people in California and if you would not be afraid of the wrath of commercial interests and sportsmens organizations and let the people decide, you would find this program an avenue to render the citizens of California a great service. Commercialism has already been evident in testimony before this Committee. Such references as those by Assemblyman Don A. Allen, Sr. that "\$400.00 gun and fishing equipment sold would be given consideration directly or indirectly". That commercial interests are being considered was further evidenced in testimony by Mr. Ardis Walker before this Committee. He indicated by inference that the planting of trout in the Kern River is needed to keep his motel business healthy. This Committee must really crack down and put Fish and Game in its proper light so that our children may also enjoy the beauties of our wonderful state.

/s/ Harry Doughty
HARRY DOUGHTY, Chairman of Recreation
Coordination Committee of N.C.W.C.A.

Subscribed and Sworn to before me this
15 day of Feb. 1960
M. G. "Buck" Conners, Notary Public
In and for the County of Shasta, State of California
My Commission expires July 31, 1960